

A Further

# DISCOVERY

of that Generation of men called

## Q V A K E R S :

By way of Reply to an Answer of *James Nayler* to the *Perfect Pharisee*.

Wherein is more fully layd open their Blasphemies, notorious Equivocations, Lyings, wrestings of the Scripture, Raylings, and other detestable Principles and Practises.

And the Booke called, *The Perfect Pharisee*, is convincingly cleared from *James Naylers* false Aspersions ; with many difficult Scriptures (by him wrested) opened.

*Published for the building up of the perseverance of the Saints, till they come to the end of their Faith, even the salvation of their soules.*

Mat. 16. 18. Upon this Rocke I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevaile against it.

Rev. 2:23. Unto you I say, and unto as many as have not this Doctrine, and which have not knowne the depths of Satan, as they speake, I will put upon you none other burden : But that which you have already, hold fast till I come.

Gatefide, Printed by S. B. 1654.







## Christian Reader.

*S*'nce our Publishing of the Perfect Pharisee, as we finde, we blesse God it hath been prosperous, to the no small satisfaction and establishing of his people, who with an humble and sober spirit, have been willing to try the spirits whether they be of God. So we see it hath provoked the spirits of these Quakers, to more obstinacy, bitterness, and railing, As in the pouring out of the fourth Vial, Men were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the Name of God, and repented not to give him glory. Now, though truly we must professe, with Reverend Mr. Eaton, Writing concerning the same people, in his Epistle to his Booke called, The Quakers confuted, That we cannot apprehend that there is any hope of convinciing these persons of the error of their way, so farre are they under the very power of the spirit of delusion, and professed enmity to the Ordinances of Christ Jesus our Lord: Yet, for the further securing, and fuller satisfying of the people of God, we are inducd to Answer this Reply of James Nayler, for the clearer manifesting of the wickednesse and folly of these men, and their Principles: And though it cost us new revilings, and more bitter cursings from this People, which we fully expect: Yet what are we, and our Names, though trodden under foot, so Iesus Christ may have the glory, and his people the advantage of our standing for the truth.

But that thou mayest know the nature of their Answer, thus it is; We charge them to hold seventeen Blasphemous and Hereticall Doctrines, besides their other principles and practises, in our Booke expressed, and what he says to them; we have given thee a short account in the Draught subjoyned to our Epistle; Wherein thou wilt easily see with what full proofs we have testified those things concerning them, though the tongues of these men accustomed to

nothing more, then to rayle, doe so confidently charge lyes upon us : But we are sure, and confident in the Lord, that we have spoken that of them, which will (if not already, as it doth to all impartiall Readers) fully, undeniably, and convincingly appeare to be truth, if thou reade the cleareness of the evidence of this ensuing Treatise.

Reader, if thou hast Read our former Booke, thou wilt finde our Arguments and assertions against the blasphemous Doctrines of these men, fully strengthened by plentifull variety of evident, plaine, convincing Scriptures ; to which thou wilt finde James Nayler in his Reply, answering not one word. Certainly, the demonstration of the spirit of God, either hath convincingly silenced him, and stopp'd his mouth (for how ready is he to catch at any trifling appearance of advantage ?) or what canst thou, or any man imagine of him, but that Scripture is nothing to him, nor his soule under any obedience unto, or conscience of the truth of God ? either of which, what a miserable and deplorable state of soule, doth it speake, when men can stand out in their blasphemies against the light of Conscience ?

It shall be our worke in this ensuing Treatise, in following James Nayler in his Reply, to answer all such Scriptures as he impertinently, and injuriously wrests, and to cleare the truths of God from their being misapplied to his horrid Principles. By which, and other occasionall passages in this Booke, thou wilt find a more full and plaine manifestation of these men, and discovery of the mystery of iniquity working in them. Consider what thou Readeest, and the Lord give thee understanding in all things.

Tho. Weld.  
Rich. Prideaux,  
Sam. Hammond.

Will. Cole.  
Will. Durant.

SINCE



*A short Draught of James Naylers Answer to  
the Booke called, The Perfect Pharisee.*

*Quakers Positions.*

1. **E** *Quality with God.* This we proved by six Evidences. He denyes but two of them, which yet we shall prove under the hand of witnesses, and his very Answers doe amount to an asserting of it.

2. *No distinction of Persons in the God-head.* This is denied by them; but we shall by further testimony cleare it to be theirs.

3. *That the soule is a part of the Divine Essence.* This he excepteth not against, nor takes any notice of our Arguments, but is full of bitter Rayling.

4. *That Christ is in every man, and in the Reprobates held under corruption.* This is confessed clearely, though seemingly denied; onely one expression is shuffled, which is yet proved by testimony under hand.

5. *That Christ was but a Figure, and Example.* This is denied by him, and miserably shuffled; yet we evidently prove it, even by their owne Bookes, and other testimony.

6. *That men are not justified by that Righteousnesse which Christ in his owne Person fulfilled, without us.* This is not denied, though so wicked a Doctrine, but a new asserted, and no tittle of an answer to our Arguments.

7. *That men are justified by that Righteousnesse, which Christ within them enable to performe.* This we proved by six evident testimonies, two of which Naylor onely shuffles in; but we shall cleare them, and answers nothing to plaine Scripture against them.

8. *That God and Man cannot be wholly reconciled, till he be brought to the state of the first Adam, and able in his owne power to stand perfect.* This he denyes, but we prove from his owne words it clearely is, and must be his meaning.

9. *He*

9. *He that commits sin, and is not perfectly holy, can never enter into the Kingdome of Heaven, unless there be a Purgatory.* This he denyeth to be so in his Booke, and rayleth, as if we charged a lye upon him; but we shall further cleare it, though in his owne answer he partly confesseth it.

10. *No real Saint but he that is perfectly holy, &c.* This he confesseth, and answers onely by rayling, but takes no notice of the Scriptures, against that Principle.

11. *Every man hath a light within him sufficient to guide him to salvation, without the help of outward light.* He confesseth all, but answers nothing.

12. *No need of outward teaching, &c.* He denyeth one testimony of ten, which yet is true; but confesseth the Doctrine, and falls a rayling.

13. *Scriptures not the Word of God, but a Declaration of the conditions of them that spoke them.* This he denyeth not: we proved it by five testimonies. He answers by one Scripture grossely perverted; and two others ignorantly applyed, but gives no answer to many Scripture arguments against it.

14. *Spirits not to be tryed by Scripture.* This we proved by three testimonies, none of which, nor the Position is denyed; but goes about to prove it, and falls a rayling.

15. *No sence, meaning or exposition to be given, or studying of Scripture.* This we proved in foure testimonies; he confesseth, goes about to prove it; but answers not a word to fourteen evident Scriptures, but falls a rayling grossely.

16. *They cry downe Baptisme, and the Lords Supper, as types and shadows.* For this we gave foure proofes, which he denyed not, and we further prove it. He shuffles from Baptisme in generall to the businesse of Infant Baptisme, and falls a rayling.

17. *No mediate call to the Ministry.* Denies not the Proof, but falls miserably a rayling, as if he would powr out his gall upon us.

As for the rest of his Reply, to what we charged upon them as their Principles and Practises, there is such palpable shufflings, such miserable weaknesse, and such horrible rayling, as that we should not have medled with it at all; but that we beleeve it is the designe of God to lay more and more open the spirits of these men.

This

**T**His Booke, pretending to Answer us, is thus subscribed,

*By one whom the World calls James Nayler.* We are not a little jealous that there lyes a mystery of iniquity in that very stile and expression. For first, God himselfe (whom to thinke to follow any sinfull expression or custome, were no lesse then blasphemous) calls men by their Names of distinction given by Men. *Gen. 22. 11. God said unto him, Abraham. Hannah called her sonne Samuel. 1 Sam. 1. 20. She called his name Samuel, &c.* and afterwards when the Lord appeared to him to call him out to the worke of the Priest-hood, *chap. 3. 4. and 6. and 8. verses, The Lord called Samuel, and called him againe so the second and third time; here its evident, that God himselfe calls him by the Name that his Mother gave him. Acts 9. 4. there Iesus Christ from Heaven calls him Saul, Saul, a Name given him before his conversion. Christ when upon Earth, calls his Disciples by the Names given them at their Circumcision; as Philip, Iohn, Simon sonne of Ionas &c. The Apostles doe so constantly, as Festus, Agrippa, Gaius, Aristarchus, &c. and this without such a mysterious preamble, as one whom the World calls Festus, Agrippa &c. You see how these pretenders to Scripture, depart from Scripture, as if they would include God and Christ under the carnall observations of the World, or else teach them to speake.*

2. It is apparant, That these very men doe constantly call themselves by these Names, as *James Nayler* doth in an Epistle at the end of *Farnsworths Booke*; *George Fox* in a Pamphlet lately Printed; and the very men of their Generation call them so, without any such preamble.

3. But shall we tell you where the mystery lyes? We are satisfied, that this expression is meerly to *cloake their pretence to an equality with God.* Our reason is evident; For in this very Answer of *Naylers*, pag. 4. where he relates *Foxes* his evading of the charge against him, that he said, *He was equal with God.* *Nayler* thus hints, that *Fox* being asked, whether he spake this of *George Fox* as he was a creature? To this he answered, *I deny George Fox, he is dust, and must be dust; but I and my Father are one.* Is not this as plaine as the Sunne, that he therefore denies

Abour men being called by names given them by their Parents.

The mystery of the Quakers stile is arising themselves (such who the World call so and so).

ayes George Fox, that he may deny his being a creature, one that must returne to dust, that so he may set up and assert his oneness with God. Compare but this with that usuall expression of theirs in their Books, *Whose name in the flesh is James Nayler: Whose name in the flesh is John Audland, &c.* and it will be more apparent. But more of this you have in our Answer to their Reply to the first Article.

About the word Priest In the Epistle in the said Answer Written by A. P. he calls us, *the Priests of the North*, a word on purpose given us to our reproach. Surely their pretended meeknesse, should have taught them other expressions; though truly we finde, and the Reader may, even in this their answer, finde more cursed rayling, then we receive from the worst of men; yet, our suffering in that kinde from them also, is not small. But A. P. might know, that every Priest was to offer both gifts and sacrifices for sinne, and that we waite not upon any such worke; and that the Gospel knowes no Chiefe Priest, but the Lord Iesus, who is a Priest for ever after the order of *Melchisedek*; nor any Priests at all properly, but the Saints, metaphorically called, a Royall Priest-hood: and shall the stile of the Lord Iesus, and his Saints be a reproach in the mouthes of *Quakers*?

He goes on, and tells the world, *That we two are all strangers to that sort of people called Quakers, except one.* A. P. (who is none the least of that sort of people) cannot but know, that he is too well knowne to all of us. Secondly, Three of these five also have had cause to know many more of them, as *M. Taylor, John Audland, Stubbs, Holmes, Atkinson, Hodgson, Ayy, &c.* and others from whom we suffered disturbance in our publique Ministry; and some of these also, are pretenders to be eminently sent forth. Thirdly, Though all of us were strangers to their persons, yet are we not strangers to them in their writings, and so, if it be possible to know them by their Papers (which they industriously scatter up and downe) we know them fully. But whither tends this aspersion, that they are strangers to all of us, save one; but to make the world beleeve that we have taken up these things against them by report? But we hope, the Reader by this time, understands the nakednesse of the slander, and the subtilty of A. P.

And

As for that evidenced which one of us gives concerning their *W.C.* principles and practises, which *A. P.* under the name of *Reports*, would insinuate into the people, *as if they were lyes*; the Reader shall observe, that the most of these evidences, are not at all contradicted by *Nayler* in his Answer, but passed over, which we take as confessed by him; others onely evaded, which yet shall appeare to the Reader in the ensuing answer, to be either such things, as he was an eye or care witness of, or shall be fully confirmed by undeniable testimony. *A. P.* goes on, and tells the Reader, that in this answer, *What is truth is owned, and what is false is denied*; truly, he could not, in so few words, have spoken more nutcrusly to prepossesse the Reader: but we beg the Reader, as to that, to suspend his judgement, till he have fully read the ensuing Discourse, wherein, whether any thing have been charged on them that is false, and whether *Nayler* have done faithfully in owning what is truth, will appeare at large.

In the Preface of *James Nayler* to his answer, he tells you, *That Christ now appearing in his Saints, to discover the man of sinne, with all his deceits and deceivable workings; now all the powers of darknesse are gathered against him, Gog and Magog.* As for those deceits and deceivable workings, truly these blasphemous Doctrines of these men, with their Diabollicall delusions and quakings, will make it appeare where the man of sin is now working. To open this, we shall stay the Reader a little.

*The Man of sin, and his workings in the last times Revealed.*

1. It is as cleare as the noone-day, 1 *Thes.* 2. chaptev. *Rev.* 12. 3. *Rev.* 17. 4. 5. 9. 10. that the Papall Apostacy and State is *The Antichrist*, so often Prophefied of in Scripture. Now it is as plaine, that the very distinguishing Doctrines and practises of these men are such, as are the maine principles of that man of sinne in opposition to *Jesus Christ*.

*Agreement betwixt Papists and Quakers.*

1. The Papists deny the imputed righteousness of *Christ* for justification, and in scorne and derision, call it, A putative Righteousnesse.

*Papists*  
bell. l. 2.  
de justit.  
cap. 7.  
*Quakers*

These also from the same spirit, deny the imputed Righteousnesse of *Christ* for justification: And *Nayler* himselfe, before the whole Court at *Appleby*, discoursing with *W. C.* about justification by righteousness of *Christ* imputed; not onely de-



nied in a laughing way ended his discourse thereabout, with this language: *That which is without, is without; So George Fox affirmed, That he that is borne of God is justified by Christ alone, without imputation;* Sauls Errand, pag. 11.

**Papist** 2. The Papists in their controversies with us, doe positively affirm, that *justification is by inherent righteousness*. Hence *Bellarmino, Salspigni, &c.* with the rest doe positively affirm, that *justitia, is onely iustum facere per inherens iustitiam*, that to justify, is onely to make righteous by inherent righteousness.

**Quak.** So these men doe as confidently affirm, that they are onely justified by inherent righteousness; or that righteousness within, which Christ within them enable them to performe. See our prooffe *Perfect Pharisee*, pag. 10.

**Papist** 3. The Papists againe doe confidently conclude, that a man may perfectly keep the whole Law; Hence their neglect of the righteousness of Christ, their works of supererogation, and the like.

**Quak.** So the Quakers, their great assertion as a challenge to all, is, that every Saint is perfect: that it is possible to be perfectly holy, and without sinne. Perfect obedience to the Law of God is their great Principle, which they confidently try up more then any.

**Papist** 4. The Papists affirm, that the *Scriptures, or the Written Word of God, are not the supreme Judge of spirits.*

**Quak.** So these people, that the *spirits are not to be tryed by Scripture.*

**Quak.** So *A. P.* in the Booke he put forth, called *Severall Papers*, p. 19. The worlds touchstone is without them and they try the spirits by the letter, &c. but the Saints touchstone is within. So that though they agree not what shall be, yet both of them consent in denying the Scripture to be the judge of spirits.

**Papist** 5. The Papists call the Scripture, a dead letter, a nose of wax, a scabbard without a sword. *Cisterius* in *Euchir.* pag. 44. *Pighius*, lib. 1. cap. 4. So *Melchior Canus* sayes, *It is most certaine, the Written Word is onely for Babes, and is no way necessary for those that are growne;* as is more full *Melchior Canus*, *defens. each. fd. contra confess. Woriburg* cap. 36.

**Quak.** So these men alio. not onely try downe the necessity of the written word; see the *perfect Pharisee*, pag. 20. but alio call it, a dead



a dead letter, a carnall letter, that they are but a declaration of them that speak it. So Melchior Canus againe saith, the Gospel is not the Scripture; as Farnworth in his Booke *Discovery of Faith*, scoffes at our saying, the foure Bookes of *Matthew, Mark, Luke and John* are the Gospel, pag. 11.

6. The great argument by which the Papists doe goe about to establish the truth of their way, is *Immediate revelations, and pretended miracles*; the want of which, they upbraid the Protestant Ministers, and charge us to be no Church.

Papists

So the Quakers doe in their pretence to an immediate call, and their supposed miracle of quaking. So A. P. *the Word of the Lord came to me saying*. So Audland, *the Word of the Lord came to me*: but of that more hereafter.

Quakers

7. The Papists doe place much of their holinesse in their *Fastings, beggarly apparell, and forsaking the World*, as they call it, *as their living mowed up in convents, and cloysters, their wandring up and downe as Hermits, and begging Fryars &c.*

Papists

So these men is knowne to place abundance of their holinesse in *Fasting, beggarly apparell, wandring up and downe the World &c.* we might adde much more; but here you may see how the man of sinne in these men in their compliance with the principles and practises of the Romish way, breaks out in his deceit and deceiverly workings.

Quakers

2. He is a stranger in the Booke of God, as to the discovery of Antichrist, who doth not observe the spirit of God mightily unvailing *Antichrist* by the revealing of the *spirits of error* in him; for 1 *John* 2. 18. there it plainly appeares, that horrid errors are of that affinity with the *Antichrist*, that when he would describe that man of sinne in the last time he calls the Heretiques by that very name, *Now are there many Antichrists, whereby we know it is the last time, &c.* Now besides those which we have named, the Reader will easily observe such a masse and heape of *Arminian, Socinian, Pamiistical* errors in their Doctrines layd downe in the *Perfect Pharisee*, that he may clearly observe where the spirit of Antichrist works in all deceiverly blennesse in this last time.

The Spirit  
of error  
the Spirit  
of Anti-  
Christ.

3. Lastly, It is the Saints bulwarke against the Papists, while they call for our miracles, that the spirit of God clearly

holds forth, that the coming of the man of sinne is after the working of Satan, with all power and signes, and lying wonders, 2 *Thes.* 2. 9. So *Rev.* 16. 13. the three unclean spirits, *ver.* 14. are the spirits of Devils working miracles, to gather together, &c. Now this further evidenceth the spirit of the man of sinne, acting in them, and their way. As for *him Gog and Magog*, *Rev.* 20. 8. to which *Nayler* compares our Books, being set forth against that generation: truly we cannot but smile at the weakness of the man, for who knows not that *Gog and Magog* refers to the time of the Jews conversion; when God will plucke up the Kingdom of the *Turkes* and *Saracens*, and is to be after the expiring of the thousand yeares, as that chapter is exceeding cleare.

Reader, we entreat thy pardon for this digression; though truly, when we came to consider, that his expression of *the man of sinne*, our spirits could not but strike in with this call of providence, to lay naked that misery of Babilonish iniquity which worketh in these men.

Difference  
in Judge-  
ment about  
discipline,  
no breach  
of a joynt  
appearance  
against the  
methods of  
Satan.

In the next place, thou wilt finde him, (that he may compare us with *Herod* and *Pilate* conspiring against *Christ*) thus charging us, *These five formerly could scarce agree in any thing, no not in that which they call the worship of God, &c.*

First, *A. P.* accuseth us, to have taken up the things we wrote against the Quakers by report, whereas he sayes, *that people was no knowne to any of us, except one*: let him now tell us whether *James Nayler* takes not up things by report, who we beleve, never saw the Face of foure of those five, whom he so boldly chargeth.

2. But is it true, *that we can scarce agree in any thing*? This is a charge, we wonder he hath such a brazen forehead, to laye against us. Doe we not all agree? and is not our reall agreement knowne in all the Doctrines of the Gospel? As for matters of discipline, we doe really confesse there is some difference in judgement amongst us. But first, Doth this make us like *Herod* and *Pilate*, who hated the very principles of the Gospel, and (as *Nayler* sayes) could not agree in *any thing*. Secondly, *Paul* and *Peter* had their difference in point of judgement, as to Circumcision, *Gal.* 2. 14. So thirdly, *Paul* and *Ba-*

*babam*

*habits* had their difference; in another case, *Acts* 15. 39. But fourthly, That rule of the Apostle, we hope shall be our rule, *Phil.* 3. 16. *If in any thing ye be otherwise minded, &c. Nevertheless whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule.* Fifthly, And as the Apostles abovesaid, notwithstanding their particular differences, even in judgement; yet agreed to oppose the enemies of Christ, and the grosse Heresies then springing up: so by the assistance of our God, we have been enabled cordially and industriously, to agree in promoting the worke of the Gospel; and we are confident in the Lord shall further be. But doth not, this favour of abundance of malice, when he says, they could not agree in any thing, *no not in the worship of God? &c.* Could we not agree in the worship of God? or doth he know what the worship of God is? or what difference is betwixt worship and discipline? surely if he had, his conscience must checke him, for charging such a lye upon us. But this it seems *A. P.* doth report, and *James Nayler* will report it.

Further, he goes on, and tells the Reader, *We are not afraid to speake evill of their forsaking the world, the pride and lusts of it; and these (he saies) we call, a sinfull neglect of their Families, triviall observations, and bely the Apostle, saying, he calls them rudiments of the World.* Reader, that thou mayst see the wilfull (and we are afraid) malicious mistake of the man; we shall give thee our owne words as they are in our Epistle, thus, *There is indeed something which pretends to holiness in this generation of men: as the meannesse of their apparel, sometimes more then ordinary abstinence, their forsaking the World (though to a sinfull neglect of their Families and Callings) and many triviall observations, which the Apostle calls, The rudiments of the world.* Col. 2. 23. Now,

1. In this the Reader may clearly see, our willingness to speake the fairliest that we in conscience could of the wayes of these men, for we say, that these things there named, do indeed pretend to holiness, and have a shew of humility, they are our owne words; so farre were we (as he would charge us) from speaking evill of any thing that doth but looke like a command of Christ.

2. He

2. He most grossly chargeth us, that we speake evill of, *Forfaking the World, the pride and lusts of it*, and that this we call, *a sinfull neglect of their Families, and civill observances*, when as its as cleare as if it were written with a Sun-beame, that we doe no such thing. For, Is there any one tittle in these our words, concerning their forsaking *the pride and lust of the world*? we hope we have so much of the dread of God upon our soules, as that it shall not enter into our hearts, to set a Pen to Paper, to please for the *lusts and pride of the world*. But what wickednesse is this, to soyl those fallshoods into our Epistle, which we never spoke.

3. It is a *sinfull neglect of their families and callings* which we speake against, (for this we know to be a sinne) but we speak not against a forsaking of the world in its proper Gospell-sence, we say that *they doe sinfully neglect their Callings*, thats apparent in their constant wandrings up and downe, Fox and Naylor themselves are two evident examples of it. And for the *sinfulness* of so doing, we referre you to these Scriptures, 1 Tim. 5. 8. *If any provident for his owne, and especially for those of his owne house, he hath denyed the Faith, and is worse then an Infidell.* 2 Thes. 3. 10. *We commanded, that if any would not worke, neither should he eate: For we heare there are some amongst you walking disorderly, working not at all.* 1 Cor. 7. 20. *Let every man abide in the same Calling wherein he was called; are thou called being a servant, care not for it, &c.* ver. 24. *Let every man in the calling wherein he was called, therein abide with God.* How doth this reprove their practise and prove the sinfulness of their neglect of their Callings? But if they should say, *That the Apostles left their Callings and followed Christ.* It is true, the Messiah had his Disciples following him: But first, Paul after the Ascension of Christ, doth leave a standing rule in the Scriptures for Christians to abide in their callings; *Commands the aged Women that were Believers, that they be keepers at home*, Tit. 2. 5. *Reproves the lightnesse of the younger Widowes, When they were wanton against Christ, they learne to be idle, wandring about from house to house, and not only idle, but eaters also, and busy-bodies, speaking things which they ought not,* as 1 Tim. 5. 11. 13. [The very Picture and pattern of the Women-Quakers.]

3. Before

2. Before they left their callings in the world, its evident they had an immediate call from Christ. *Mark* 1. 17. *Iesus said unto them, Come ye after me, &c.* where he immediately calls *Simon* and *Andrew*; *James* and *John*, calls also *Philip*. See *John* 1. 43. and *Matthew* from the receipt of *Custom*. *Mar.* 9. 9. We know these men will pretend to the same immediate call; but we have fully answered in *the perfect Pharisee* p. 45. 46. to the vanity of that pretence.

3. They were called forth to an Office and publique worke in the Ministry, which was not a neglect of their Callings, but a changing of them. Now this publique worke of Ministry, these men will not sure pretend they are called to, for they doe cry downe all Churches, and Ministeriall employment, as to outward teaching, as wholly needlesse.

4. And lastly, *Paul* after this reproves Christians for leaving their callings. *2 Thes.* 3. 10. *1 Tim.* 5. 13. which had not been if their example had been binding.

4. As to a right forsaking of the world according to the mind of Christ, we must againe say, It lyes not in a Monkish changing of apparell, nor wearing of a band, and giving over to labour in their callings, it lyes in no such thing; but it essentially consists, in these two things.

1. A crucifying of affections to the world, so that the soule sits loose, as to all the possessions and comforts of it, and can see so much in Iesus Christ as to satisfie it selfe, by which we are preserved in an holy indifferency as to the things of this world, and can freely submit to the Lord, as to any providences in things below. And so we can affirme, that a man may forsake the world, and yet enjoy his possessions in it. *Abraham*, *Isaac*, *Nebemiah*, *David* &c. men all of vast possessions, and yet true forsakers of the world. Were not those believe's rich, whom the Apostle chargeth, *1 Tim.* 6. 18. that they be ready to distribute, &c. but their forsaking of the world, was in this, that they be not high minded, nor trust in unceraine riches; not in their leaving their families and callings; but that *1 Cor.* 7. 29. 30. 31. Let them that have wives, be as though they had none; they that rejoyce, as though they rejoyced not; they that buy, as though they possessed not; and they that use the world, as

not

not abusing it; for the fashion of this World passeth away.

2. It consists in a willingness of spirit to part with these things when thereunto called; which is in case of competition betwixt Christ and our enjoyments; in reference whereto, the Saints have need to sit downe before-hand and reckon this, the charge of the Gospel may cost them one day their dearest comforts, as it costs us the scandals and reproches of our Persons at this day from these Quakers. See this *Mat. 10. 37. He that loveth father and mother more than me, is not worthy of me.*

And the case being thus opened, if any shall nourish their idleneſſe, under a pretence of forsaking the World; we dare freely tell them, that they make the Scriptures a slave unto their lusts, and walke contrary to the plaine rules of it.

5. Lastly, there is another false charge layd upon us, as *that we doe call the forsaking of the World, pride and lusts; a triviale observance, the rudiments of the World, and will-worship.* We have shewed already, that we spoke not a syllable in that Epistle of the pride and lusts of the World, (that soyled in by *James Nayler*) We now adde, that it is as malicious a scandall; to say, we call forsaking of the world, a triviale observance, &c.

The quakers  
beggars  
by elements

The Reader may see we speake of *their triviale observances as of another businasse, things distinct* from that of forsaking of the world: And because he would so palpably wrest our words, we shall tell him what those triviale observances of theirs are; such as these, *their not saluting, not putting off a Hat before a Magistrate, their shewing every man, not calling men Masters; and such like;* like those of the Apostle, *Col. 3. 21. of touch not, taste not, handle not:* Now as such as these, as to a soules placing his holinesse and religion in them, we dare boldly call, *Beggarly elements;* and the rudiments of the world; so we yet againe say, that he that shall place so much of his perfection in such triviale observances as these, he walke indeed in a *show of wisdom, in humility, and will worship, and neglecting the body,* (not in any honour) to the satisfying of the flesh, that is, to the satisfying of the fleshy principles of Legall righteousness, puffed up and fed with such acts of will-worship.

Having thus traduced us, he begins to cry up his owne followers, for their obedience to the commands of Christ. We wonder



Wonder how they can so much as pretend to obedience to the command of Christ, when it is evident, that the whole generation of them, will not submit to his righteousness, establishing a righteousness fulfilled in themselves : Nay, tis their great work, to deny his righteousness fulfilled in his Person to be imputed to us for justification ; As also, they deny many other truths, with a full opposition to Gospel-Ordinances, Prayer, Supper, Baptisme, Church-Government, Ministry : whom can he perswade, that such as these are brought up to obedience to the commands of Christ ?

Lastly, In the conclusion of his Preface he tells you, *that they are persecuted by us* ; In which accusation, we shall appeal to the Reader. Whether they be the persecuters of him that is borne after the spirit, or we ? For first, It is evidently knowne, that while we are carrying on the worke of the Gospel in our respective Congregations peaceably ; some of them have come no lesse then threescore miles to revile us, and smite us with the tongue of bitter reproaches, in publique Congregations, nay, even in the time of exercise, to the great hindering of the seed of the Word, which questionlesse is the designe of Satan in those their confusions. And are we the persecuters ?

2. If causing such tumults, and their such bitter slanders of us in the time of worship, have brought them at any time within the compasse of Law, we must tell them, that that was a suffering as evill doers ; and no persecution, if it be a sinne to breake the Peace, and traduce and take away the good names of others. Yet even in such cases also, they may remember, how many of them were discharged the Towne, without Imprisonment ? and such as were Imprisoned, how soon released ?

3. If reproaching with the tongue be persecution (for what else was *Ishmaels* persecuting of *Isaac*, to which that texts relates *Gal. 4.* what was it *Gen. 21. 9.* but *Ishmael* mocking *Isaac* ? ) we may say, we have had as large measure thereof from this people, as might fill pages to set downe in particular.

4. If our *Broke* be the persecution, *Pauls* zeale against wicked principles and unlawfull practises, may as well be called persecution, as our pleading for the truth of Christ against op-

The disobedience to the commands of Christ, and the Ordinances.

Who are the persecutors betwixt us and them discovered

posers, we being set for the confirmation and defence of the Gospel.

We now proceed to take notice of his answers to the Positions they have asserted; the first is,

Position 1. *Their Equality with God.*

Excep. 1. **T**O the first Proofs, that *George Fox* affirmed, *He was equal with God*; *James Nayler* answers, and sayes, that is in false that *George Fox* did say, that *George Fox was equal with God*.

Reply. Let the Reader take notice, that *Nayler* in his reply, doth not deny our proofs at all, when we say, that *George Fox* said these words, *I am equal with God*; he doth not except against this at all.

2. *Naylers* further reply plainly doth evidence it also; where he confesseth that *George Fox*, when he was asked, *Whether he was equall with God*, said, *I deny George Fox, he is dust, &c. but I and my Father are one*. VVhere he clearly asserts his oneness with God, as to equality, (for that was the question the Justices put to him.) So that our proof against him stands cleare by his owne confession.

Now the strength of *Naylers* answer lyes in this evasion, which we doubt not but any that have their eyes open, will discover to be the subtilty of the Serpent, viz. he doth not deny that *George Fox* said, *He was equall with God*; but denyes that he said that *George Fox was equall with God*; where *Nayler* makes *Fox* to distinguish ignorantly, and make a difference betwixt *George Fox*, and himselfe, so that though *George Fox* is not equal with God; yet he that is called *George Fox* is equal with God. Now to this blasphemous evasion, we thus answer.

1. If *George Fox* for his blasphemy, be turned into Hell; what will become of *him*? that is, what will become of that person that is called by the name of *George Fox*?

2. Is not the name alwayes given for the distinguishing of the person; yea, even when they are in a blessed state, translated from corruption. *Mat. 17. 3. there appeared Moses and Elias talking with him*; they were *Moses* and *Elias* still, though in a state of glory. So that the person is understood and distinguished by the name; and therefore by the name *George Fox*, must be understood in our Booke, the person distinguished by that name; we were never so childish as to thinke, that a bare



bare name, without its relation to the person distinguished by it, any should cry up to an equality with God; we speak of the person understood by *George Fox*. Such cobweb answers, and childish evasions, may satisfie such deluded spirits as *Nayler*; but we cannot but in the feare of the Lord cry out, Oh! the plotted blasphemy of these men.

3. Did ever any of the Saints of God in the old or new Testament distinguish in this way? Did not *Paul* say, *Paul a servant of Iesus Christ*, not saying, *I deny Paul*, *Paul is dust*, and *must so dust*, but *I am a servant of Iesus Christ*? what unscripturall and ridiculous language is this?

4. Hence you may see, it was not without reason, that we were jealous of a mystery of iniquity lying under these distinctions, betwixt *George Fox*, and *himselfe*; and in these words, *one whom the World calls James Nayler*; and in *Francis Howgill* his paper, called *A wee to Kendall*, *one whom the World calls*, F. H.

5. The very evasion that *Nayler* useth, is a very great demonstration to us, that *George Fox* asserted he was equall with God. For *Nayler* confesseth he was present when *George Fox* was asked whether he spoke *this* of *George Fox* as he was a creature. Now here is a cleare confession, that *George Fox* did say, *He was equall with God*, thats confessed he spoke *this*; onely the question was about the sence of these words, and whether he spoke them of himselfe as a creature. What ever the person were that asked *Fox* that question, we would leave this upon his conscience, what apprehensions he had of *Fox*? For by the necessary, and infallible rules of reason, there is nothing that hath a being, but is either a creature, or a Creator; and if *Fox* have an other consideration (as that question clearly implies) besides that as a creature, it must necessarily, be as a Creator, and so his equality with God is asserted. Well, tis confessed he spoke these words, 2. In this answer he denies *George Fox* as a creature; the meaning therof as given in answer to that question, must be this, that *George Fox* as a creature denies to be equall with God; but that he, as under some other consideration is equall with God, he denyes not; nay asserts it, when he sayes, *I and my Father are one*.

6. We cannot but presse it upon the Reader, that in these debates, about equality with God, it had been easie for *Naylor* or *Fox*, to have declared their totall inequality with God, and not so to have deluded the people in such fond distinctions, as I am equall with God, and yet *George Fox* is not equall with God; nay, this debate certainly, was an eminent call to them to disclaime it, if this wretched principle had not filled their hearts; yet in stead of our ingenious denying of this blasphemy, their whole worke is falsely to assert it under the cloake of subtle and unscripturall, nay, blasphemous distinctions and evasions.

John 10. 3.  
opened.

Now for the Scriptures he so blasphemously abuseth, they are these two. First *John* 10. 30. *I and my Father are one*; this Scripture, that it is properly and incommunicably spoken of Christ, God and Man, and cannot be applied to any meere creature, we shall thus make evident. The Person there spoken of is first in the 9. ver. the Doore. *I am the Doore, by me if any enter in, he shall be saved.* Is *George Fox* the doore? 2. That Person spoken of affirms, ver. 18. *that he hath power to lay downe his life of himselfe, and power to take it up againe.* Hath *George Fox* that power? 3. In ver. 26. He saith to the Jewes, *Ye cannot believe, because ye are not of my Sheep.* Dare *George Fox* say so? The reason why men doe not beleewe, is it because *George Fox* hath not elected them from Eternity. 4. That Person there spoken of saith, ver. 27. 28. *My Sheep heare my voyce. and I give unto them eternall life; neither shall any man plucke them out of my hands.* Is it not blasphemy for *Fox* to assert these things of him selfe? 5. He also saith, *My Father that gave them me, is greater then all,* ver. 29. Did the Father give the Elect to *George Fox*? Now ver. 30. this Person of whom these things are spoken, it is, who is one with the Father. And you may as well ascribe the other five considerations to *George Fox*, or any meere creature, as this, that he and the Father are one. But oh! the greatnesse of his ignorance of God, of Christ, of Scripture, of himselfe, which is the cause of such most wretched blasphemies.

1 Cor. 6. 17.  
opened.

This next Scripture is, *1 Cor.* 6. 17. *He that is joyned unto the Lord is one spirit.* The designe of the Apostle there, being

to dehort from Fornication, upon the account of that union that is betwixt the Fornicator and the Harlot, *ver. 16. they are one body; for two, saith he, shall be one flesh*, doth adde a further reason to the Saints, *be that is joynd to the Lord is one spirit. V. 15. Shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an Harlot, God forbid?* Now that this Text doth not hold forth a Beleevers equality with God, will thus appeare. For first, The strength of the Apostles argument in this place, is by the membership of a Beleever to Christ, to prove the exceeding sinfulness of taking a member of Christ, and making it a member of an Harlot: all the union it holds forth betwixt us and Christ, is onely as we are members of the Lord Jesus. Now the membership of a Beleever with Christ, is nothing to prove his equality with God. For first, The implantation of a Beleever into Christ being by Faith in his death, and Faith it selfe being a finite grace, can no way bring the soule into an infinite equality. 2. Besides, *Paul* after membership by Faith in Christ, yet complained of a *body of sinne*, which utterly disclaimes all equality with God.

2. The nature of this union speaks no physicall oneness; for as there is no physicall oneness betwixt the Fornicator and the Harlot, neither are they *physically one body*, though so called, out of a relative respect: so neither is there any such physicall oneness betwixt Beleevers and Christ. And without the soules *physicall oneness* with God, there can be no equality betwixt it and God; nay, if Christ were not essentially one with the Father, neither could he be equall with the Father.

Having thus seen the full meaning of these Scriptures, we beleeve (Reader) thou wilt wonder how the Justices could heare the Scriptures so blasphemously abused, and yet be satisfied, as *Vaxier* pretends, they understanding his affirming his equality with God, of the spirit of Christ in him. For, did they thinke, that the *spirit* did essentially dwell in *Fox*? how then came they to be satisfied, when *Fox* attributes that to himselfe, which is the spirit's property? or, how comes he to be the same essentially with the spirit of God? or, did they conceive, the spirit in *Fox*, to be the graces or fruits of the spirit? how then could they be satisfied, if so; in as much as those fruits of the spirit

6. We cannot but presse it upon the Reader, that in these debates, about equality with God, it had been easie for *Naylor* or *Fox*, to have declared their totall inequality with God, and not so to have deluded the people in such fond distinctions, as I am equall with God, and yet *George Fox* is not equall with God; nay, this debate certainly, was an eminent call to them to disclaime it, if this wretched principle had not filled their hearts; yet in stead of our ingenious denying of this blasphemy, their whole worke is falsely to assert it under the cloake of subtle and unscripturall, nay, blasphemous distinctions and evasions.

*Iohn 10. 33.*  
opened.

Now for the Scriptures he so blasphemously abuseth, they are these two. First *Iohn 10. 30. I and my Father are one*; this Scripture, that it is properly and incommunicably spoken of Christ, God and Man, and cannot be applied to any meere creature, we shall thus make evident. The Person there spoken of is first in the 9. ver. the Doore. *I am the Doore, by me if any enter in, he shall be saved.* Is *George Fox* the doore? 2. That Person spoken of affirms, ver. 18. *that he hath power to lay downe his life of himselfe, and power to take it up againe.* Hath *George Fox* that power? 3. In ver. 26. He saith to the Jewes, *Ye cannot beleeve, because ye are not of my Sheep.* Dare *George Fox* say so? The reason why men doe not beleeve, is it because *George Fox* hath not elected them from Eternity. 4. That Person there spoken of saith, ver. 27. 28. *My Sheep heare my voyce and I give unto them eternall life; neither shall any man plucke them out of my hands.* Is it not blasphemy for *Fox* to assert these things of him else? 5. He also saith, *My Father that gave them me, is greater then all,* ver. 29. Did the Father give the Elect to *George Fox*? Now ver. 30. this Person of whom these things are spoken, it is, who is one with the Father. And you may as well ascribe the other five considerations to *George Fox*, or any meere creature, as this, that he and the Father are one. But oh! the greatnesse of his ignorance of God, of Christ, of Scripture, of himselfe, which is the cause of such most wretched blasphemies.

*1 Cor. 6. 17.*  
opened.

This next Scripture is, *1 Cor. 6. 17. He that is joyned unto the Lord is one spirit.* The designe of the Apostle there, being

to dehort from Fornication, upon the account of that union that is betwixt the Fornicator and the Harlot, *ver. 16. they are one body; for two, saith he, shall be one flesh*, doth adde a further reason to the Saints, *he that is joynd to the Lord is one spirit. V. 15. Shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an Harlot, God forbid?* Now that this Text doth not hold forth a Beleevers equality with God, will thus appeare. For first, The strength of the Apostles argument in this place, is by the membership of a Beleever to Christ, to prove the exceeding sinfulness of taking a member of Christ, and making it a member of an Harlot: all the union it holds forth betwixt us and Christ, is onely as we are members of the Lord Jesus. Now the membership of a Beleever with Christ, is nothing to prove his equality with God. For first, The implantation of a Beleever into Christ being by Faith in his death, and Faith it selfe being a finite grace, can no way bring the soule into an infinite equality. 2. Besides, *Paul* after membership by Faith in Christ, yet *complained of a body of sinne*, which utterly disclaimes all equality with God.

2. The nature of this union speaks no physcall oneness; for as there is no physcall oneness betwixt the Fornicator and the Harlot, neither are they *physcally one body*, though so called, out of a relative respect: so neither is there any such physcall oneness betwixt Beleevers and Christ. And without the soules *physcall oneness* with God, there can be no equality betwixt it and God: nay, if Christ were not essentially one with the Father, neither could he be equall with the Father.

Having thus seen the full meaning of these Scriptures, we beleeve (Reader) thou wilt wonder how the Justices could heare the Scriptures so blasphemously abused, and yet be satisfied, as *Vayter* pretends, they understanding his affirming his equality with God, of the spirit of Christ in him. For, did they thinke, that the *spirit* did essentially dwell in *Fox*? how then came they to be satisfied, when *Fox* attributes that to himselfe, which is the spirit's property? or, how comes he to be the same essentially with the spirit of God? or, did they conceive, the spirit in *Fox*, to be the graces or fruits of the spirit? how then could they be satisfied, if so; in as much as those fruits of the spirit

Spirit are in their best capacity, but a new creature, and so in no way equall with God: But were they all satisfied? How then was it, that Mr. *Sawry*, a Member of the late Parliament, and as unpreposessed as any of the Justices then present, was so fully satisfied, that *Fox* was really, and by confession guilty of those blasphemous words, that he said *he was equall with God*, that he openly declared against him in the presence of them all, and urged the Justices, that *Fox* was clearely guilty of that blasphemy by his owne confession before them all. Now for what he addes, concerning Dr. *Marshall* his Oath, *That one of the Justices, who was present at Lancaster, when Fox spoke those words, did openly there witness against Marshalls false Oath in the hearing of the open Court.* Let the Reader know,

W.C.

1. Tis true that Justice did so, in the hearing of one of us; but did it in such a way, with his head hanging downe, and a low voyce, that spake clearely enough to obliervant hearers, he had more will to accuse him, then either confidence or reason.

2. That Justice was Coll. *Benson*, tis true, he was at *Lancaster*, and tis as true, he was a *Quaker* long since, and before that time, and had made it his worke to ride up and downe about that businessse, to get *Fox* discharged from his blasphemy; and what such a partiall evidenece is, to gaine-say the Doctors Oath, let the Reader judge.

3. Besides, the Dr. swore it, and so did Mr. *Altham*; but Coll. *Benson* onely whispered it, or said it at the utmost.

4. It was fully evidenced after in *Lancaster*, before the whole Country. 5. But to discharge our selves, and to cleare up the truth beyond all denyall, we have here given you the testimony of the said Dr. *Marshall* and Mr. *Altham* sent to us, and dated at *Lancaster*, Jan. 19. 1653.

*George Fox* said, *That he thus sanctifieth, and they that are sanctified, are one, and they are equall,*

*George Fox* being asked, *Whether he was equall with God?* answered thus, *I am equall with God.*

The truth of these two Articles against *George Fox*, we have already witnessed by deposing our Oaths before the Magistrate at severall times; and still witness, though now our testimony be



be not so necessary as formerly, since the observant Reader may discern, what we witness more generally held out in their owne Booke, particularly in the Booke entituled, Samls Errand to Damascus, pag. 8. line. 8. See also their answers, pag. 5. 6. and 10.

Jan. 19. 1653.

*William Marshall.*

*Michaell Altham.*

Thus we have you see, fully cleared our first testimony. And *Excep. 2* for the second, That *Nayler* said, He was as holy, just, and good as God: against which, *Nayler* thus excepts, *It is an untruth, and was never spoken by me. nor ever did it enter into my thoughts; but is a lye, rayfed up by the father of lyes, the Devill, and vented by his servants, to make the truth odious, and so goes on, denying that ever Will. Baldwinson heard him say so, &c.* We thus answer.

Surely this man thinks by his rage to darken the truth of this *Reply 1:* testimony: but that thou mayst againe acquit us, and see that *James Nayler* makes no conscience of lyes; as we have given thee the testimonies of *Dr. Marshall*, and *Mr. Altham* for the former; so we here give thee a large account of the prooffe of this horrible blasphemy under the hand of *Will. Baldwinson*.

*January 14. 1653.*

Sir,

**Y**OU Writ to me to certifie you of some Words that I heard from *James Nayler* and *Richard Farnsworth*, as they call themselves amongst us. I my selfe went to *George Bateman* his house in *Underbarrow*, called the *Crag*, and there was a great deale of people come in to the house, and *Nayler* and *Farnsworth* sitting beyond a Table upon a Bench; and there *Nayler* speaking, and teaching, Perfection, and to be attained to in this life, and to be without sin; this teaching so did trouble me, as being contrary to the Word of God, that I stood up before the Table and spoke these words, Friends, doe you hold that a man may attaine to that

Spirit are in their best capacity, but a new creature, and so in no way equall with God? But were they all satisfied? How then was it, that Mr. Sawry, a Member of the late Parliament, and as unpreposessed as any of the Justices then present, was so fully satisfied, that Fox was really, and by confession guilty of those blasphemous words, that he said *he was equall with God*, that he openly declared against him in the presence of them all, and urged the Justices, that Fox was clearly guilty of that blasphemy by his owne confession before them all. Now for what he adds, concerning Dr. Marshall his Oath, *That one of the Justices, who was present at Lancaster, when Fox spoke these words, did openly there witness against Marshalls false Oath in the hearing of the open Court.* Let the Reader know,

W. C.

1. Tis true that Justice did so, in the hearing of one of us; but did it in such a way, with his head hanging downe, and a low voyce, that spake clearly enough to observant hearers, he had more will to accuse him, then either confidence or reason.

2. That Justice was Coll. Benson, tis true, he was at Lancaster, and tis as true, he was a Quaker long since, and before that time, and had made it his worke to ride up and downe about that business, to get Fox discharged from his blasphemy; and what such a partiall evidence is, to gaine-say the Doctors Oath, let the Reader judge. 3. Besides, the Dr. swore it, and so did Mr. Altham; but Coll. Benson onely whispered it, or said it at the utmost. 4. It was fully evidenced after in Lancaster, before the whole Country. 5. But to discharge our selves, and to cleare up the truth beyond all denyall, we have here given you the testimony of the said Dr. Marshall and Mr. Altham sent to us, and dated at Lancaster, Jan. 19. 1653.

George Fox said, *That he that sanctifieth, and they that are sanctified, are one, and they are equall,*

George Fox being asked, *Whether he was equall with God?* answered thus, *I am equall with God.*

The truth of these two Articles against George Fox, we have already witnessed by deposing our Oaths before the Magistrate at severall times, and still witness, though now our testimony be



be not so necessary as formerly, since the observant Reader may discern, what we witnesse more generally held out in their owne Booke, particularly in the Booke entituled, Samls Errand to Damascus, pag. 8. line. 8. See also their answers, pag. 5. 6. and 10.

Jan. 19. 1653.

*William Marshall.*

*Michaell Altham.*

Thus we have you see, fully cleared our first testimony. And *Excep. 2* for the second, That *Nayler* said, He was as holy, just, and good as God: against which, *Nayler* thus excepts, *It is an untruth, and was never spoken by me, nor ever did it enter into my thoughts; but is a lye, raysed up by the father of lyes, the Drvill, and vented by his servants, to make the truth odious, and so goes on, denying that ever Will. Baldwinson heard him say so, &c.* We thus answer.

Surely this man thinkes by his rage to darken the truth of this *Reply 1:* testimony: but that thou mayst againe acquit us, and see that *James Nayler* makes no conscience of lyes; as we have given thee the testimonies of Dr. *Marshall*, and Mr. *Altham* for the former; so we here give thee a large account of the prooffe of this horrible blasphemy under the hand of *Will. Baldwinson*.

*January 14. 1653.*

Sir,

**Y**OU Writ to me to certifie you of some Words that I heard from *James Nayler* and *Richard Farnsworth*. as they call themselves amongst us. I my selfe went to *George Bateman* his house in *Underbarrow*, called the *Crag*. and there was a great deale of people come in to the house. and *Nayler* and *Farnsworth* sitting beyond a Table upon a Bench; and there *Nayler* speaking, and teaching, Perfection, and to be attained to in this life, and to be without sin; this teaching so did trouble me, as being contrary to the Word of God, that I stood up before the Table and spoke these words, Friends, doe you hold that a man may attaine to that

that height of perfection in this life to be as perfect, as pure, as holy and just as God himselfe? And they joyntly replied, Yea, and they were so. And one in the house spake and said, My question was not to the purpose? And I answered and said, But it was, because I knew no such thing by my selfe. And after these words, they began to teach, that every man had a light within him, if hearkened to, would teach, guide and save him: And I replied againe and said, how is it that our Saviour Christ sayes, There is no man comes to me, except my father which sent me draw him; before God and Christ draw, where is my light? and so that they spake not one word; so I went home from amongst them. But the day of the Month, nor the Month I set not downe, I not fearing the danger of this Heresie. All these words were spoken in the same house in the night time.

We do testifiethis to be Will.  
Baldwinsons owne testimony.

Will. Baldwinson.

Tho: Walker. John Wallace.  
John Myriell.

2. Here thou hast our innocency vindicated; and now what reason hath *Nayler* to call us the servants of the Devil, and venters of lyes? when as thou seest his deniall of that testimony, is but the backing of his owne blasphemy with a notorious lye, which must needs fly in in his face, if he have any sparke of conscience left in him.

3. This full testimony gives a further discovery of their Positions we formerly layd downe; as first, Their asserting perfection in this life, and to be without sinne. As also secondly. Not onely *Nayler*, but *Farnsworth* also affirmed, he was as holy, just, and good as God. for so saith *Will. Baldwinson*, they joyntly replied, Yea, and they were so. Thirdly. That every man hath a light within him, if harkned to, will teach, guide and save him.

Thus we can blesse the Lord that our being forced by *Nayler* his charging us with lyes, to vindicate the truth hath been an occasion to discover the blasphemies of these men more apparently and convincingly unto all.

But

But we wonder how they dare deny these things? or why Naylor should stand disputing against these testimonies? when their being equall with God is fully layd downe in Foxes owne words in Print; See *Sauls Errand to Damascus*, pag. 8. and line 8. *He that hath the same spirit that rayseed up Iesus Christ, is equall with God.* And againe thus, line 11. &c. *As Iesus Christ which is the mystery, hath passed before, so the same spirit takes upon it the same seed, and is the same where it is made manifest.* Where it is clearly his designe to shew, that there is the same hypostaticall union betwixt the spirit and our nature, where the spirit dwels, as was betwixt the Divine nature, and the Humane in the Lord Iesus.

To our ptoofe, that George Fox affirmed, He was the Judge *Excep. 3* of the World. Naylor denieth it not, but replies, by *insisting* that expression; And tells us, *we are grossely ignorant of Christ, and naylor at us exceedingly.* For this he quotes 1. Cor. 6. 2. 2. *Know you not that the Saints shall judge the World.* Hence he abuseth the Scripture to inferre, that George Fox is the Judge of the World.

For the opening of this Scripture, know first, *That the Father Reply.* hath committed all judgement to the Sonne, Iohn 5. 22. Acts 17. *31. God hath appointed a day in which he will judge the World in* *1 Cor. 6. 2. opened.* *righteousnesse by that Man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given an assurance unto all men, in that he hath rayseed him from the dead.* Where you see plainely, the Father hath eminently appointed Iesus Christ alone, that *man to be the Judge of the World.* How then comes George Fox to be *Judge of the World?* for the Scripture doth but hold forth *One to be the Judge of the World,* even the Lord Iesu, whom the Father hath therefore furnished with all necessary qualifications, viz. of infinite power, infinite knowledge, infinite presence, things absolutely necessary for *the Judge of the World,* 1 Cor. 15. 25. Again, It is one thing to Judge the world, and much another thing to be *the Judge of it;* there is very much difference betwixt these two: but George Fox must be, either *the judge,* or none it seems. 3. It is not said, the Saints *doe judge* the world, (that's proper to the Lord Iesus) but tis said, they *shall judge* the world, they *shall judge* Angels, the Apostles kept very

strictly and closely to the expression of the *future*, clearly holding forth, that he means of their judging of the world at the end thereof, and the resurrection of the dead, according to that of Christ concerning the Apostles in the day of judgement, *Mat. 19. 28. Verily I say unto you, that you which have followed me in the regeneration, when the Sonne of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. We shall not need to speake of the manner of their judging, as Iustices at the Bench, by subscription, or assent to the righteous proceedings of the Lord Iesus at that day.*

And is it not still apparrant to be a blasphemy for Fox to say, he is *the judge* of the world? And can the abusing of this Scripture help him? And what reason hath *Nayler* to charge us with grosse ignorance; and rayle upon us upon this account; but we have layd this open enough to any Reader. Onely this we shall adde, in *Sauls Errand to Damascus*, pag. 6. it is objected against Fox, that he professed himselfe to be, the *Eternall judge* of the world; not onely the judge, but the *Eternall judge*; and this he doth not at all deny, but blasphemously goeth about to iustifie it. This is suitable to that which one of these *Quakers* lately wrote to an eminent Officer in the Army, who told it himselfe to one of us, *viz. Looke to the lights within thee which cannot sinne, whereby thou wilt judge and determine God-like.*

His next justification of that title, is bottom'd upon that *1 Cor. 2. 15. I Cor. 2. 15. The spirituall man judgeth all things.* To which we answer, that he that is acquainted with the Originall, will easily perceive that the word *judgeth* in the 15. ver. is the same with that in the 14. ver which is rendred *discerned* *ἀναγινώσκει*, ver. 15. *ἀναγινώσκει*, so that the meaning of the expression is no more, but the spirituall man discerneth all things; *All things*, *viz. τὰ τὰ μυστήρια*, the spirituall mysteries of the Gospel: this is evident, that these all things are *τὰ πάντα μυστήρια*, for the Apostle is speaking of the *Mysteries of the Gospel*, ver. 7. the wisdom of God in a mystery; he is speaking of such things, ver. 9. which God hath prepared for them that love him; and ver. 11. the things of God. ver. 12. the things freely given to

us of God; *ver. 13.* things spoken of, such things as are *ver. 16.* the minds of Christ; So that *Naylor* is wise to seek when he applies this as he doth: the spirituall man tis true, doth discern the mysteries of the Gospel and minde of Iesus Christ; these things of the Kingdome of God are not knowne to the men, or Princes of this VWorld: but what is this, to prove this? therefore it is lawfull for *George Fox* to say, he is the Iudge of the World. Did ever *Paul*, or any of the Apostles conclude from their *Spirit of discerning* that they were the *Judges of the World*? Will a discerning of the mysteries of the Gospel, raise up men to sit in Christs Throne, and to judge, and condemne, and pronounce irrevocable sentence against others, (as the practice of some of the *Quakers* is?) That spirit of discerning is there onely attributed to the spirituall man, *as to the mysteries of the Gospel*; Will a discerning of Gospel mysteries, prove a power to discern the *final State and condition of soules*, *what it shall be to all eternity*? Is there not a large ignorance of their owne hearts, even in such as have a large measure in Knowledge of Gospel Doctrines? And is not this the Prerogative of God; to search the hearts? *Ier. 17. 10. Iob. 1. 35.* And is discerning & judging all one? *1 Tim. 5. 24.* Some mens sins are open before hand; yea, God doth now fully *discerne and know* the states of soules; yet the *judging* of the world speaks more then a bare act of *Knowledge and discerning*. For there is a time, when that God that knoweth the thoughts of mens hearts, yet doth not execute this sentence of judgement upon their soules; *Eccles. 8. 11. Rev. 6. 10.* *How long, O Lord, &c. dost thou not judge, &c.* but God hath the *day* of his wrath, and of the revelation of his righteous judgement, *Rom. 2. 5.* So that he that shall consider how farre short *discerning* doth fall of this sort of *judging*, how farre short discerning of *Doctrines* doth fall of either judging or discerning the *future and final State of soules*; how evidently this Scripture is wrecked to lift up sinfull creatures into a blasphemous arrogancy of the very Attributes and Office of Christ, will easily see, how sinfully *Naylor* hath done to serve the Antichristian pride of *Fox*, who, as God *2 Thes. 2. 4* will needs sit in the Temple of God, and shew himselfe that he is God.

*Excep. 4* To our Proove further, That *George Fox* was called by one of those Quakers, *the Sonne of God*. *Nayler* sayes, *You that are offended that one shall witness the Sonne of God, shew that you are ignorant of the new birth, &c.* 1 *Iohn* 3. 1. 2. *Behold, &c.* that we should be called the Sons of God. Now blush for some that you should be Ministers of the Letter, and are ignorant of it. Thus farre he.

*Reply.*

How Christ  
the Sonne  
of God  
how the  
Saints are  
Sonne.

That *Iesus Christ* is onely the Sonne of God essentially, and according to Scripture expression emphatically and distinguishingly called *the Sonne of God*, is very cleare; *Mat.* 16. 16. *Simon Peter answered and said, thou art Christ the Sonne of the living God*. This is that famous confession of *Peter* which *Christ* said, *Fl. sh.* and blood had not revealed to him, which is in that expression rayled up to such a pitch, that it is impossible it should be meant in the ordinary notion of the Sons of God, as when applied to regenerate persons, as is plaine by these two eminent expressions of *flesh* and *Blood* hath not revealed this unto thee; and upon this confession, (not upon *Peters* person) *ver.* 18. *Upon this Rocke I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevaile against it*. Consonant to this is that, upon the miracle wrought by *Christ*, *Mat.* 14. 33. *they in the Ship, worshipped and said, of a truth thou art the Sonne of God*. Can *George Fox* testifie his being *the Sonne of God* by such a miracle? Nay, *Heb.* 1. 5. you have a challenge for the distinguishing Sonneship of *Christ*; *Unto which of the Angels said he at any time, thou art my Sonne, this day have I begotten thee.* *ver.* 8. But unto the Sonne he saith, *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever*. Here you have his Sonneship vindicated from being communicable even to the very Angels; though in other places called, the Sonnes of God, *Iob* 1. 6. *Iob.* 38. 7. *when the Sonnes of God shouted for joy*. Thus we have proved the essentiall Sonneship of *Christ*, and how that expression, *the Sonne of God* is emphatically and distinguishingly given to him, so as not to be communicable to the best of creatures. For the creatures of God, when any of them are called the Sonnes of God, it is upon one of these two accounts. 1. Either of Creation, *Luke* 3. 38. *Adam* is called, *the Sonne of God*. 2. Or of Adoption, *Gal.* 4. 5. *to redeem them that were under the Law,*



that they might receive the adoption of *Sonnes*. We know what the adoption of *Sonne-ship* of Belcevers is, and doe blesse God that this manner of love is given us, that we should be called the *Sonnes* of God: 1 *John* 3. 1. But first, Either hence to appropriate Christ his incommunicable title of being by *eternall generation the Sonne of God*. Or secondly, from that adoption, to assert an *equality with God*, we can account no lesse then blasphemy. Now let the Reader know, that the reason why we produced that expression of *George Fox* being called *the Sonne of God* by one of that way, was to prove their conceits, of an *equality with God*. Had *Nayler* confessed that his looking upon *Fox, &c.* as son by adoption, doth not carry him up to look upon them as *equall with God*, we should not have troubled the Reader further as to this particular: but in stead of confessing, he goes about to prove what the other had asserted; so that we have reason still to see that name of *Sonne* but made a cloake to usher in *Foxes* his intruding into, being distinguishingly and emphatically called *the Sonne of God*, and being (according to his owne words) equall with the Father. But if they will still play with the Phrase of *the Sonne of God*; yet the understanding Reader will observe, that that expression, was but one of the six Prooves we gave, that they had asserted an equality with God, three of which are already evident beyond exception.

There are two more deep and pertinent prooves against them as to this: One is, That their usuall expression is *that they can see mens hearts*; questionlesse, this is Gods incommunicable Attribute, *Jer.* 17. 10. *I the Lord search the hearts*. The other is an expression used by *Nayler*, himselfe to one of us to this purpose, How God *should reveale any thing to him, and he, viz. Nayler, not know it*. As if God knew nothing, but *Nayler* knew it. Oh the horriblesse of such expressions! the Reader may wonder with what patience we can write such things. Yet these two so fully speaking to prove that they assert an equality with God, *Nayler* wholly passeth over, though himselfe was the author of one of them.

So that it still stands fully evident against them, that they doe assert an *equality with God*,

Reader,

Reader, If thou wonderest at the length of our answer to this particular, truly the dread of the great God hath been here in upon our soules, and we thinke no time or paines too much to vindicate the honour of our dread Lord, and his Sonne Jesus Christ, remembering that his glory he will not give to any other.

Position 2. *That there is no distinction of Persons in the God-head.*

*Except.* Against our prooffe, for this *Nayler* objects, That *such a Position is not in Sauls Errand to Damascus; and sayes, we have not any prooffe for what we here asseue of.*

• *Reply 1.* That *George Fox* in *Sauls Errand to Damascus*, pag. 12. being asked, *Whether there be one individuall God, distinguished into Father, Sonne, and holy Ghost.* Answered, *It was but a busie minde so to aske, &c.* (so little respect he hath to that saving mystery of the Trinity) this that Booke will witnesse. And that we had reason to inferre this Position to be a principle of their way, will thus appeare.

1. If *Nayler* had taken notice of our Booke, he might have considered these words immediately following, *With other assertions of the same kinde, knowne to some of us.* Now had he considered this, he might have seen, that we did not gather that this denying of the Persons, &c. was their Principle, *onely from what Fox layes downe in Sauls Errand to Damascus, pag. 12. but from that of Fox, together with other assertions of the same kinde, knowne to some of us:* We know it to be ther Principle, by comparing that expression of *Fox*, with what our selves did know from others of them; those truths compared, were our prooffe of that assertion, as the Reader will presently fully see.

2. Had we had no other ground, but that expression of *Foxes*, when he sayes, *Its a busie minde to enquire, &c.* this had been enough? For certainly, if *Fox* thinke it to be a busie minde to enquire it, its cleare, he doth not beleeve it himselfe, as he would not have it to be a matter of any others Faith.

3. But thirdly, Doth he say, we have not any prooffe for what



what we here accuse of? Let both him, and all men know, that we have not charged that assertion on them, without sufficient evidence. *Tomlinson*, an eminent man in that way, in his Book called, *A Word of Reproofe to the Priests*, pag. 4. line 20. boldly affirms, *the spirit to be no other but Christ himselfe in flesh*. Is not this to deny the Trinity, and take away the distinction of Persons in the God-head? 2. One of us doth know, this was the Principle of *Mr. Taylour*, Coll. *Benson &c.* and so it was not asserted without reason, and their owne spirits and consciences will beare me witnesse. 3. A godly Minister in *Westmoreland* wrote to us, that one of his charge being perverted to become a *Quaker*, affirmed, *that there was one God but no such thing as a distinction of Persons in the God-head*; and spoke many words passionately against it. W.C.

And now whether there is not just cause to charge them with maintaining this blasphemy, will be fully manifest; and how an iustly *Nayler* hath so reviled us upon this account. But we leave him to the Lord to rebuke.

Position 3. *That the soule is a part of the Divine Essence.*

To that we layd downe as to the prooffe and confutation of *Except* this; *Nayler* onely replies, *What the soule is you know not, who live in the fall, and are vaine contenders and pleaders for sinne*; and so goes on grossly rayling.

For the prooffe the effect downe, let the Reader observe, that he doth not in the least deny it, though it be a blasphemous Principle. And one of us doth still affirme, that he was an eare witnesse of it. Secondly, Here we might very well expect, that sith he could not deny our prooffe, he should answer to our confutation of that blasphemy. Against which we have given six reasons, but instead thereof he falls a rayling, as if a *Rabshakebs* spirit were divine Rhetoricke. And what sayes he? He sayes, *We know not what a soule is, and that we pleade for sinne, &c. and seeke gaine from our quarters &c.* This is his answer to our arguments. We shall not trouble the Reader with answering their scandals, and revilings but for the example of Christ before our eyes, *1 Pet. 2. 23. who when he was reviled, reviled not againe.* Rep'y.  
W.C.

Position

Position 4. *That Christ is in every man; and in the reprobates he is held under corruption.*

*Excep.<sup>1</sup>* To this *Nayler* answers thus, *When will you cease to add your lyes to slander withall?*

*Reply.* We admire how the man can have so much impudence to charge lyes upon us. When as first, within six lines *Nayler* himselfe confesseth, that he said, *That if an Indian were there, he should witness against him*, viz. *W. C.* for affirming, *that Christ did not dwell in the Indians that never heard the Gospel.* For the said *W. C.* did he not thinke the conscience of *James Nayler* scared, durst appeale to himselfe, whether that discourse was not about every mans having a light within them, and that light to be Christ, so that he cannot but remember, that he affirmed Christ to be a light within the very Indians. Secondly, *Nay* further, lines 16. 17. *Nayler* most ignorantly reasons, *that Christ is in the most vile in the World, else he cannot judge them.* Certainly had the man any sparke of conscience or ingenuity left, he durst not in the same page, and with the same breath, deny and affirme the same Doctrine.

*Excep.<sup>2</sup>* But oh! thou full of all subtilty; Did I say, *that Christ in the reprobates is held under corruption?* let all that were there be witness against thee.

*Reply.* 1. In our proöfe there is no such thing layd to *Naylers* charge. For that Position of theirs as we layd it, consisteth of two parts; and *Nayler* might clearly have seen, that he is brought onely as a proöfe to the first part of it, viz. *That Christ is in every man*; for all he is charged with, is, *that he extended the in-dwellings of Christ to Indians*; and therefore it shares but of the fulnesse of his gall, thus to poure it out without cause. The proöfe of the second part, viz. *that Christ in the reprobates is held under corruption*, we layd downe in our second proöfe, in a Letter of *Iohn Audlands* to *Edward Briggs*, which Letter *Nayler* doth not deny. For having told him, he was damned; yet he also tells him, that he crucifieth Christ within him, &c. What is this, but to affirme Christ under corruption? But to make this further cleare, this *Nayler* himselfe in *Edward Briggs* his house used this expression, *Father, raise up thy*

*owne Sonne from under bondage*, as we have it from his testimony under his hand in a certificate dated Jan. 14. 1653. And to put it yet out of all possibility of denyall, that the juggling of these men may further yet appeare in denying their owne Principles; We give you a part of a dispute betwixt M. *Sanderson* a Minister of the Gospel, and severall *Quakers* at *Peirce-bridge*, Decemb. 11. 1653. attested by the subscriptions of ten severall persons, part of which concerning the thing in question, we have given you word for word.

*Quaker*. Is not Christ the true light in every man? speake.

*Mr. Sand.* Where Christ is, he rules as a King, but in all he doth not so exercise his Government. Therefore &c.

*Quaker*. In some, he is kept under corruption, and this I witness, he is subdaed in me; this I pawne my salvation upon.

*Mr. Sand.* Its Blasphemy to say that a finite corruption should keep under an infinite Christ, this is to make corruption stronger then Christ.

*Quaker*. Well, if a man obey the light within him, he will be happy, &c.

How undenyably doth this convince this man of his faithlesse and perfidious dealings, in seeking most unworthily to shuffle off a Principle so fully owned by them, viz. *that Christ in the reprobates is held under corruption*, yea, notwithstanding his confident denyall of this principle; yet *Nayler* immediately forgets himselfe, and falls to proving of it, in justification of *Audlands* Letter, from Heb. 6. 4 6. *that its impossible to renew them againe to repentance, sith they crucifie to themselves the Sonne of God afresh, and put him to an open shame*; whence he would prove, that Christ Jesus is in the reprobates, because they crucifie afresh the Sonne of God.

Heb. 6. 4. 6  
opened &  
indicated.

1. Let the Reader observe, it is not said, they crucifie the Sonne of God in themselves but *to themselves*. How then doth this Text speake any thing to the upholding of his error?

2. Those the Apostle writes to were *Hebrews*, the *Jews*; such as were of that people that crucified and put to death the Lord of life, Now, as it doth not follow, that because they

crucified him upon the Crosse, therefore he was in them; so neither doth it follow, that Iesus Christ is in reprobates and apostates, because they crucifie him afresh unto themselves. This is enough to shew, that though Apostates doe crucifie the Sonne of God to themselves; yet it no way followes, that Iesus Christ is in every man, and in the reprobates is under bondage. And for as much as it is affirmed, that those Apostates there spoken of, are included under an impossibility of salvation, it must necessarily follow, that if *Nayler* will suppose that Christ doth dwell in those, then he must affirme that Christ doth dwell in those whose sins are unpardonable, that have sinned a sin against the holy Ghost.

*Excep. 3* There are yet these things objected to iustifie this Principle, *Iohn 1. 9. this is that true light that lightneth every man that cometh into the world.*

*Iohn 1. 9. opened.* For the opening of this Scripture, you are to know, that *Iohn* is speaking here of the Eternall Word, *In the beginning was the Word, all things were made by him, &c.* so that his designe is to manifest the Divinity of Iesus Christ, and the Creation of the world by him; in which Creation, he enlightneth every man that comes into the world; *He was in the world, and the world was made by him;* these being the words immediately following that expression, *of enlightning every man &c.* Its cleare as can be, that that light is that which was implanted in the soules in the first Creation. Now that this light which in the first Creation was implanted in the soule, and so is in every man that comes into the world, is 1. Neither Christ. 2. Nor a Knowledge of Christ as Mediator. 3. Nor is a light sufficient to bring to Gospel salvation, we shall fully cleare, and so discover how miserably this Text is wrested by them.

*Light in all men, is not Christ in all men.* 1. That that light there spoken of, which is implanted in the soule in the first Creation, is not Christ. will thus appeare. First, Its a light Created by Christ in the soule, and so cannot be Christ himselfe, unlesse they will blasphemously affirme Christ to create himselfe. 2. For this light, with which he enlightneth the soule, must either be by creation, or by hypostaticall union, viz. by the dwellings of the Divinity of Christ in every man, as he was personally in the humane nature, when the

the Word was made Flesh, and dwelt amongst us; which how horrid a blasphemy were it to assert, and how loathsome would it be to any that knowes but the *first* Principles of the Gospel. And here we must againe tell *James Nayler* of his wicked blasphemy, in affirming, that *Christ as Man dwells in him*; which though we proved against him in the Booke he pretends to answer; yet he wholly passeth that over in silence without a tittle of exception, which we cannot but interpret, as his confession, that it is his Principle,

2. That that light, which by Christ in the creating of the world is implanted the soule, is not a Knowledge of Christ as Mediator, we shall thus evidence.

Light in all  
gives yet  
no know-  
ledge of a  
Mediator.

1. First, This was the light of the *first* covenant, viz. a covenant of workes, which did not at all hold forth or make out a Mediator, for it was that light which was given forth in the *first* creation, in which *Adam* stood onely under a covenant of workes; neither needed a Mediator before his fall; upon which fall, the *first* light of a Mediator breakes out in a promise, *The Seed of the Woman shall breake the Serpents head*, as in *Gen. 3. 15* ver.

2. The knowledge of Christ as Mediator, the Scripture purely holds forth, as a matter of meer Revelation given forth by God in the second covenant, and not implanted in the soule in its *first* creation. *Mat. 13. 11. to you it is given to know the mysteries of the Kingdome of Heaven, but to them it is not given.* If Christ doe enlighten every man in the Knowledge of himselfe as a Mediator, how then comes this Scripture to speake so distinguishingly? *to you it is given, to them it is not given*; which exception of Christ, doth clearely deny the *quakers* universality, that *its given to all*. To this is parallell that of Christ to *Peter*, when by the Fathers peculiar revelation, he understood Iesus to be Christ. *Mat. 16. 17. Blessed art thou Simon bar Iona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee, but my Father*, where he cleares *Peters* Knowledge of Christ as Mediator, not to be from any principle of light created or naturall Knowledge, but from a peculiar revelation from the Father, and pronounceth him blessed upon the account of that distinguishing discovery. How fully doth that place of *Paul* for

ever dash any pretence to a power to know Christ as a Mediator by that naturall light which is in every man that comes into the world: 1 Cor. 2. 14. *the naturall man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, for they are foolishnesse unto him, neither can he know them, for they are discerned spiritually.* There the Apostle gives the reason why no light implanted in our natures in the creation, can discern the things of the spirit of God, because they are spiritually discerned; where he makes an opposition betwixt naturall and spirituell light, and puts an impossibility upon discovering Christ by the light of Nature. We may adde that, ver. 9. 10. *Eyes hath not seene, Eares hath not heard, neither hath it entred into the heart of man to conceive, &c. but God hath revealed them unto us by his spirit.*

3. That that light which by Christ in the creating of the world is implanted in the soule, is not a knowledge of Christ as a Mediator, will appeare by undeniable examples; for there are multitudes of men and women, without contradiction never knew the Lord Iesus as a Mediator, though it must be confessed, they had a rationall or naturall light. Those thousands of Saints that went over into new England, fully experienced it, that there is not the least hint of a Christ implanted in those Indians, one of us having often conversed amongst them, can also fully witness it; as is more fully also evident by the confessions of many of them in Print, who have been converted by the Ministry of Mr. Eliot, of which we spake in the *Perfect Pharisee*, pag. 19.

But may not these Scriptures fully confound these mens perverting of that Scripture. Reade *Psal. 143. 19 He shewd his Word, unto Iacob, his statutes and judgements unto Israel; he hath not dealt so with any people, and as for his judgements they have not knowne them.* *Psal. 79. 6. Powre out thy wrath upon the Heathen that have not knowne thee.* *Col. 1. 26. the dispensation of God is given to fulfill the Word of God, even that mystery which hath been hid from ages and generations.* But let Paul determine the contrary, to whose judgement we shall desire to stand, 1 *Thef. 3. 2. All men have not Faith.*

Light in all  
not suffici-  
ent to save

3. That this light which by Christ in creating of the world is implanted in man, is not sufficient to bring to a Gospel salvation,



vation, is also plaine from what we have convincingly proved, that this naturall light may be in thousands that never knew the Lord Iesus as a Mediator: and *Iohn 17. 3. this is life eternall, to know thee the very God, and Iesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* So that there is an utter insufficiency and incapacity in this light to bring to salvation. So that though *A. P.* hath lately expressed his abhorring the distinction betwixt naturall and spirituell light; yet our Lord Iesus and the Apostles are so full in it, that they are of more authority with us, then the novell opinion of *A. P.*

Thus you see this Scripture fully vindicated from their wrestlings; for hence it is apparent, that though Iesus Christ (by whom the Father made the world, *Heb. 1. 2.*) in his creation of man did enlighten, and create a principle of light, and naturall reason, and understanding in the soule (which we have proved is eminently there understood) yet this proves nothing for the *Quakers*, that either therefore every man that hath a reasonable soule Christ dwells in him, or that he knowes Christ, or that his naturall light can possibly suffice to bring to Gospel salvation.

*Naylers* next defence is this ridiculous argument, *If Christ Except 4 be not in the most wile in the world, &c, how shall he judge every one according to their thoughts, as well as according to what they doe? must he proceed as carnall Iudges doe, by proesse, or confession, and no further?*

We need say no more to shew the simplicity of this argument, then to aske them these questions; Doth the Scripture say, that Christ is in the Devills, and yet he sees, and knowes, and judgeth them? Or doth the Scripture say, that the damned in Hell Christ is in them? Nay, but doth not Scripture speake in this language, *Christ in you the hope of glory, Col 1. 27.* so that Scripture speaking of *Christ in you*, speaks of him, as being the hope of glory where he dwells: And is Christ in Devils and damned soules the hope of glory? For neither the *Quakers* nor we are in this controversie at all disputing concerning the ubiquity of the Divine Nature, by reason of which he is above all, and through all, and in all. But of Christ in us, in that sense the Gospel useth the expression, *viz.*

*viz.* as a saving light and principle, the hope of glory.

2. How ridiculous is it from Christs knowing all things, to inferre, *that he dwells in all*? can he not know things unlesse he dwell in them? Doth he not know the inward motions of Brutes, Horses, Fishes? &c. and is it Scripture Language from thence to inferre his dwelling in them? Oh! the vaine nesse and frothinesse of such a spirit; and how are these men given up to blasphemy. We shall conclude with that of David, Psal. 11. 4. *The Lord is in his holy temple, the Lords throne is in Heaven: his eyes behold, his eye-bids try the children of men.*

He hath another argument, *that Christ dwells in the Saints*; which we know, in its Gospel-sense; but not in *Naylers*, *that Christ as man dwells in them*: but how absurdly and un-scripturally doth this conclusion follow, therefore *Christ doth dwell in all*.

Thus you see our proofes fully confirmed, his lyes confuted, his perverted Scriptures cleared and answered, and the folly of his arguments fully opened, though he hath not answered one of our arguments, and many Scriptures against that Doctrine.

Position 5. *That Christ in the Flesh, with all he did and suffered therein, was but a Figure, and nothing but an Example.*

*Excep.<sup>t</sup>* O deceiptfull spirits, &c. are those words expressly found in Sauls Errand to Damascus, as you say they are, let that Booke be witnesse against you, and your lying slanders to all that reads it.

*Reply.* Surely this man pretends neither to conscience, nor modesty, that doth challenge us here for a lye for saying, that Doctrine was expressly found in *Sauls Errand*. He that shall but looke upon that Booke, pag. 2. pag. 8. pag. 14. shall begin to know the impudence of *James Nayler*, pag. 2. 9. line last, in the schedule annexed to the *Lancashire* Petition to the Councell of State, you have this charge, *Richard Hubbetborne* wrote, *that Christs comming in the Flesh, was but a Figure*. Now, are we lyars in affirming those words are expressly found there? Nay, further, in pag. 8. where *Hubbetborne* answers to that charge, we will give you his owne words, *Christ in his people is the substance of all figures, types and shadows; fulfilling them in them;*  
but

but as he is held forth in the Scripture-letter without them, and in the flesh without them, he is their example or figure, which is both one, that the same things might be fulfilled in them, that was in Christ Iesus. Could a man have spoken more plainly to affirme what we asserted of him? And doe we adde our owne imaginations to make them odious; when we say, according to their principle, those things that are held forth of Christ without us (as Hubbethorne sayes) must be acted over againe within us; and so Christ must be borne of the Virgin in us, and Iudas, and Herod, and Pilate must be in us to betray and crucifie him. Is not this the plaine assertion of Hubbethorne? the same things must be fulfilled in us that was in Christ Iesus, as he was held forth in the Scripture-letter, and in the flesh without us. And this we also proved by an assertion of George Bateman, pag. 29. to which Nayler answers nothing.

But further, it shall yet appeare, that its cleare in *Sauls Er- rand to Damascus*, pag. 14. where George Fox expressly sayes, *Christ his flesh is a figure, for every one passeth through the same way that Christ did, who comes to know Christ in the flesh.*

What a seared conscience must this man needs have, that when this Doctrine is expressly found in those evident places in that Booke, yet hath the impudence, against the light of conscience, to say, *Let that Booke be witness against you, and your lying slanders therein to all that reade it.* But both you and we shall both learne what this man and his way is.

You say, this was written in a Letter which Nayler wrote to *Excep 2* one in Lancashire, viz. *That he that expects to be saved by him that dyed at Ierusalem, should be deceived; which is a most filthy untruth &c.* and so he goes on railing.

1. It is acknowledged that that Letter which had this Do- *Reply.*ctrine in it, that Christ was but a figure, was not Naylers Letter, in which that other passage is, we mistooke Nayler for Hubbethorne and that it was in a Letter from Hubbethorne written to one in Lancashire: Take this ensuing Testimony of Mr. Moore, a godly Minister in Lancashire.

**R**ichard Hubbethorne wrote, that the coming of Christ in the flesh, is but a figure, or an holding out in outward

allions amongst men, those things that he will truly, spiritually, and really doe in the spirits of his people at his second coming. This but being objected against him, as denying the Lord that bought us. He replied in another Letter, Thou dost not understand what I meant by that expression, &c. These words being often objected to the Quakers, and particularly to George Fox, though some of them made an answer to the but, yet none of them deny it in these parts that I can heare of. These Letters were sent to Henry Holme, and are now in my hands.

Kellet in Lancash.  
Jan. 16. 1653.

William Moore.

Thus you have our confession of our mistake, onely of the Name, you see the truth of the thing convincingly evidenced.

But that it is a *filthy nurture* that *Nayler* wrote such a Letter in which were those words, *He that expects to be saved by him that dyed at Ierusalem, should be deceived*; we answer.

First, *Nayler* may know that we doe onely affirme, that *Doctor Marshall* did object this against him at *Appleby*, and *Master Iagues*, Minister of *Bolton* in *Lancashire*, sent his promise that he would make it appeare. Had *Nayler* denied that either of these two were true, he might have charged us with a falsehood; but this he doth not, he dare not doe. 2. Though *Nayler* doe so cry out against this as a slander, yet he that considers this their Principle, *that Christ with all he did in the flesh is but a figure* (which is proved to be their principle beyond exception) will wonder why *Nayler* should looke upon this as a slander, when it is the necessary consequence of that wicked Doctrine; for if Christ were but a Figure, I should no more expect to be saved by him, then by the figures and types of the Law. But because the man so loudly cryes out against this, as being a *filthy nurture* that ever he wrote such a Letter (though he deny not what we say, that this was objected against him by *D. Marshall*, and that *M. Iagues* engaged to justify it) yet we have affixed *M. Iagues* Testimony to satisfie the world of our cleareness from the scandals and wicked reproaches of *Nayler*, and this sent us under his Hand and Seale.

**J**ames Nayler in a Letter which he writ to Henry Holmes, gave out this expression, If thou expect to be saved by him that dyed at Iernsalem, thou art deceived.

*Hoc unum test.*

John Jaques.

There is but one thing more in *Naylers* answer, whereby he shuffles this Position, and that evasion is this, *We doe owne and confesse that Iesum Christ in the flesh is a figure or example*; as if figure and example were all one. To which we answer.

1. We challenge *James Nayler* to shew one title of Scripture wherein Iesus Christ is called a Figure. The first *Adam* is called a Figure, *Rom. 5. 14.* the Tabernacle called a Figure, *Heb. 9. 9.* but Iesus Christ is never called a Figure; and therefore it is a sinfull shuffle of *James Nayler* thus to confound an Example and Figure.

2. If he be a Figure, we againe affirme, he must typifie something; but we referre you to our Booke (as to Christ not being a Figure, or onely an example) where we have layd downe many Scriptures and arguments, to which he answers nothing, *Perfect Pharisee*, pag. 8. 9.

Position 6. *That men are not justified by that righteousness of Christ, which he in his owne Person did fulfill, without us.*

Reader, thou wilt see in our Booke we had foure proofes for this; three of which *Nayler* denyeth not; and for the fourth we referre thee to Mr. *Jaques* testimony: so that as to the truth of the assertion we must take it for granted, especially considering what *George Fox* saith, in *Sauls Errand to Damascus*, pag. 12. *He hath a borne of God is justified by Christ alone without imputation.* This gives us to understand the meaning of *Naylers* answer to that Position, thus;

*That righteousnesse Christ hath performed without us, was not my justification, &c. untill Christ appeared in me, &c. and appeared*

Excep. 3

Reply.

Iesus  
Christ not  
a Figure.

Except.

peared in me my righteousness, sanctification, justification, and redemption, &c.

**Reply.**  
Fox deny-  
ing imput-  
ed righte-  
ousnesse  
in plaine  
termes.

1. Let but the Reader compare this of *James Nayler*, with that expression of *George Fox* viz. *he is justified by that alone without imputation*; and that of *Anthony Hodgson* viz. *I beleeve to be saved, not by the righteousness of Christ imputed to me, but by the righteousness of Christ inherent in me*, which he doth not deny, he will learne the meaning of *Naylers* words, to be clearly this *that Christ in a man is the master of his justification*; so that though he labour to colour over the businesse in this answer, by saying, *Christ was not his justification, till he appeared in him*; yet comparing his answer with these testimonies, it will appeare to be downe-right equivocation and shuffling.

**Question**  
betwixt  
Quakers &  
us, concern-  
ing the  
matter of  
justification,  
but the  
time.

2. For *Nayler* cannot but know, that the question is not at all concerning the time when *Jesus Christ* becomes actualy my justification, but concerning what is the matter of our justification whether the righteousness which *Christ* in his Person did performe, or the holinesse which he worketh in us, be the matter of our justification when we are justified? Now notwithstanding *Naylers* shuffling, its cleare their sense is, that whensoever the soule is justified (for we speake not of the time) the matter of its justification is not that righteousness which *Jesus Christ* in his owne Person did performe without us. *Nayler* himselfe at *Appleby* in discourse asserted, *He was justified by Christ in him*; and being there told by one of us, that justification is an act of God for *Christs* sake absolving me from the guilt of sinne, not done in me, but without me in the Court of Heaven. *Nayler* said nothing to this, but, that which is without is without. See *Mr. Higginsons* Booke; pag. 78.

Further  
proof that  
*Christs*  
righteous-  
nes is the  
matter of  
our justifi-  
cation.

Now that the righteousness of *Christ* performed without us, is the matter of our justification whensoever we are justified, besides what we have layd downe undeniably from the Scriptures in the *Perfect Pharisee*, pag. 10. will further appeare by these testimonies, *Rom* 3. 24. *Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, &c.* *Isay* 53. *He was wounded for our transgressions, and through his stripes we are healed.* *Ver.* 5. 6.



he layd on him the iniquities of us all, ver. 11. he shall beare their iniquities: where Christs merit or righteousness, is the reason of the non-imputation of sinne to the soule. But what need we adde more in a case, which is so full a Principle of the Gospel. But of this enough, we shall adde more in the next Position. As for reckoning *Drunkards and Swearers* to have as much right to what Christ did and suffered at Ierusalem, as we, we looke upon it as one of his reviling fits and passions, and leave him to the Lord to rebuke him. But this is all the answer he gives to the many Scriptures against his Doctrine layd downe by us.

Position 7. *That men are justified by that Righteousnesse, which Christ within us enabled us to performe, or (which is in effect, and some of them have expressed) by inherent holinesse.*

We proved this to be their Doctrine by six testimonies. None of which are denied; onely he quarrels at one expression in one of them, viz. the third, which *Nayler* layes downe, viz. *We are not reconciled to God, till we be perfectly holy, and able to stand so in our owne power*; he quarrels at the last clause of this, of which we shall give you an account in the next Position, whether it properly is to be referred: but the first branch of it, viz. *we are not reconciled to God, till we be perfectly holy*, this he denyeth not, but asserts againe in his answer thus, *No imperfect thing can be reconciled to God*; so that the charge stands cleare against them, notwithstanding the heresie of the Tenger, and the loud out-cryes of *Nayler*, as if we slandered him.

And to put it further out of question, we shall adde these besides *Naylers* confession in the present answer. *John Wilkinson* of *Hutton* in the hearing of *Mr. T. W.* Minister at *Kendall*, and *Mr. G.* affirmed, that the light within men would not onely discover sinne, but also redeme from it, and justify. *Capt. Roberts Lucas* of *Kellot* in *Lancashire*, attesteth under hand, that *Robert Wither* said, that men are saved by the workes of Christ, which he worketh in them, and maketh them to worke. *John Charn* affirmed to *Mr. T.* and *Mr. Gr.* that holy and steepe walking with God, was a Saints covering from the wrath of God.

New proof  
that qua-  
kers justifi-  
cation is  
by inher-  
ent righte-  
ousnesse

so that this Principle stands cleare, notwithstanding his evasions.

**Excep. 1.** He chargeth us with wresting truth to slander, by saying, that his affirming, *that the light within man will bring to see God, and so leade to iustification*, doth hold forth *iustification by inherent righteousness*.

**Reply 1.** To this we answer, that it is evident to us it is the sense of his words : for let any sober spirited Christian consider his words, *the light within*, by bringing a man to exercise a pure conscience in the-seate of God towards God and man in up-rightnesse, will so leade up to iustification and peace : what doth this but plainly speake, that we are justified by obedience to this light in the exercise of a good conscience towards God and man : for, saith he, it doth so leade to iustification &c.

**Excep. 2.** But what saith he againe, *that no imperfect thing can be reconciled to God is plaine in Scripture*. This he layes downe to prove (if it would serve) the truth of that Position, *that we are justified by inherent righteousness*.

**Reply.** We answer, That *Paul* was reconciled to God is plaine, and that he was justified which are the same, *Rom. 5. 1. 9. 10. 11.* but that *Paul* was imperfect, when yet he was reconciled to God, *Rom. 7.* will abundantly evidence. He that sayes *I am carnall, and sold under sinne*, ver. 14. was not he then imperfect? *What I doe, I allow not; what I would that I doe not; but what I hate, that doe I*, ver. 15. he that was in this condition, was he not imperfect? He that *had a Law in his members warring against the Law of his minde, and leading him into captivity to the Law of sinne*, ver. 23. was not he imperfect? He that in the sense of his body of death, cryed out, *Wretched man that I am, &c.* was not he imperfect? How ignorant doth *Nayler* discover himselfe to be of the conditions of the Saints of God. Was not *Peter* imperfect, when he curst and denyed his Master, *Mat. 26. 72.* but that then he was in a justified state, we know none that ever questioned. But this grosse fancy of his owne perfections, and ignorance of the misery of *iustification*, runs him upon such bold assertions and desperate rockes as these. What an uncomfortable Doctrine had this

Justification  
on constant  
the Saints  
infirmities.

this been to *Paul*, when he was complaining of the *body of his sin*, to have told him, therefore he was not justified, nor reconciled to God? with what a glorious Gospel spirit would *Paul* have challenged such a man, as he doth *Angels, Principalities, and Powers*, Rom. 8. 27. 38. *It is God that justifieth, who shall condemn us? It is Christ that died*; fetching out a pardon and justification from the blood of Jesus, notwithstanding his owne imperfection in the worke of holinesse.

To your Position, of *being justified by our owne workes*, we Except 3 deny, for it is he that worketh in us to will, and to doe, &c. and herein we deny selfe-workes &c.

This is the old thread bare shafle of the Papists, when they Reply, are prest by the Protestants, and their justification by workes. Or inherent holinesse is confuted by Scripture; they constantly answer as *Nayler* doth: they deny their being justified by their owne workes which flow from a Principle: their owne power; but say, that the workes by which they are justified, are such as flow from grace, or the workings of God within their soules. They say that by the first, *ne hominem justificare posse* men cannot be justified; but, *per opera qua ex fide Christi & gratia fiunt homines justificari*, by the workes which flow from Christ. All this while both Papists and Quakers assert justification by inherent holinesse, not by the righteousness of Christ imputed, onely they pretend it is not by their owne power. The full confutation of which Popish and Anti-christian Doctrine we have layd downe in the *Perfekt Pharisee* at large pag. 11. and to which *Nayler*, according to his wonted presumptuous confidence, answers nothing.

Censure of  
Papists and  
quakers a-  
bout justifi-  
cation.

Bell. de ju-  
tification. l. 1. c. 19

Position 8. *That God and man cannot be wholly reconciled, till he brought into the state of the first Adam, and able in his owne power to stand perfect.*

*Nayler* first excepts against this assertion, that the *Booke shall Except 1* witnesse against us, and sayes, *mans being able to stand in his owne power, was never spoken by him, nor thought by him*; and sayes, *that though the word be twice repeated to stand in Gods power, yet they are not ashamed to wrest it to their owne power, &c.*

1. To

*Reply 1.* 1. To this we answer, that the *Booke* which he saith shall witness against us, hath not so much as once the words, to stand in Gods power, though *Nayler* say, *those words are twice repeated*; for the quize is in these words; *Whether God created Man and Woman perfect without sinne, and able in his power to have stood, if they had not forsaken his power, and consented to the wisdom of the Serpent?*

The nature  
of the power  
of the  
first Adam  
considered

2. From these words, *We considering the nature of the state of the first Adam, to which Nayler sayes, man must be brought before he be reconciled.* could not but gather, that standing in mens owne power, must be the sense of those words. Our reason is plaine: For, That power which *Adam* had to stand in his state of perfection, was given to him as the Prodigals portion into his owne hand; but the power that the Saints now are to stand by is a power in the hand of the Lord *Iesus*, given to him as a feece in trust: for in this lyes the difference of the power in the sons of men in the first and second *Adam*: our standing in the second *Adam* being by a power and support in the hands and dispose of the Lord *Iesus*, by reason of which it is alone, *that none can plucke us out of the Fathers hands*, *Ioh. 10.* And the standing of the first *Adam* being by that portion of power which was intrusted in his owne hands, without any promise of assistance or perseverance from God. So that it is apparent, that when *Nayler* saies, *Man must be brought into the state of the first Adam before he be reconciled*; he must meane, he must be able to stand in his owne power, without any engagement of support from God, for that was undeniably the state of *Adams* power. Let *Nayler* shew us a titlle out of Scripture, where *Adam* had any thing of promise or assistance for his standing, more then the power he had in his own hands, which was his owne power.

3. If yet *Nayler* will shuffle, that this is not one of the Doctrines of the *Quakers*, we shall further convincingly cleare it from the very words of *George Fox*, in a Booke entituled, *To all that would know the way to the Kingdoms*, pag. 10. he profanely, and like a perfect Atheist, scoffes at the grace of God, saying thus, *And to you that tempt God, and say, Lord give us a sight of our sins, &c. this light within you lets you see it, so*

you

*you need not tempt God to give you a sight of your sins, for ye know enough, &c. and give over tempting of God to give you a sight of your sins. And to all yee that say, God give us grace, and we shall refrain from our sins, there yee have got a tempting customary word, for the free grace of God hath appeared unto all men, &c.*

*Foxes horrible jeering at the grace of God.*

Hence thou seest Fox most wretchedly asserting these two things.

1. That to pray for sight of sinne, and for power from sinne, is a tempting of God. 2. That to pray for light and power for the discovery of sinne, and refraining from it, are needlesse: for so he saith, *ye need not tempt God to give you a sight of sinne, and cease from saying, God give us grace, for the grace of God hath appeared to all men:* so that he plainly affirms, that all men have both a light and power also, that they need not be beholding to God to give them, nor to aske them of him; for he addes the reason, *Why you need not aske it of God, for you have a light within you, and you know enough, &c.*

What a wretched Principle is this, and how contrary to plaine Scripture? *If any man lack Wisdome let him aske it of God?* James 1. 5. where the Apostle bids the poore creature to beg wisdome of God, though Fox scoffe at it. *Open thou my eyes, that I may see,* Psal 119. 18. *Give me understanding,* Job 34. 31. 32. *Surely it is meet to be said unto God, that which I see not, teach thou me.* 1 Peter. 5. 10 where Peter prayes, *The God of all grace make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you.* Ephes. 3. 14. 16, *for this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Iesus, that he would grant you to be strengthened with might by his spirit. Every good, and every perfect gift, comes downe from above from the Father of lights,* James 1. ver. 17. Now here you may see the practice of the Saints, and the wickednesse of Foxes profane jeering at the grace of God, with sending men to their owne light and power in opposition to the grace of God: and how all the lyes that Naylor chargeth on us, while he denyes this Position, doe fully fall upon his owne head, while it is as confidently asserted by the grand Master of this Babylonish mystery.

The second exception is this, *You that say, that Adam in the*  
*fige*

*state of innocency was under a covenant of workes, make it appears to all that know Adams state, that you never know it; for the Law, wherein is the covenant of workes, was added after &c.*

*Reply.*

Adam in  
innocence  
under a co-  
venant of  
workes,

What we have said at large about Adams being under a covenant of workes, and how much better a state the Saints are in by interest in Christ, then the soule of the first Adam was, the Reader may finde at large in the *Perfekt Pharisee*, pag. 12. 17. to which he hath answered nothing, as his manner is; but we shall further adde.

First, *Adam* was under a covenant of living by doing, or by obedience to the Law, which is plainly a covenant of workes: who knowes not this? *In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely dye*, Gen. 2. 17.

2. *Adam* was under such a Covenant as had no Mediator, upon his breach of the command, there was none by that Covenant to interpose betwixt him and death; which is a distinguishing consideration betwixt the two Covenants made with the first and second *Adam*.

3. And for *Naylers* reason, He was not under the *Covenant of Workes*, because the Law was given after; we may laugh at his ignorance. Was the Law never knowne, before it was written upon Tables of Stone? Did God make *Adam* a rationall creature wholly ignorant of his will? Doth the engraving of the Law in Tables of stone interre, that *Adam* had not the engraving of that Law upon his heart, or that he was not under the command or covenant of that Law? but that we have proved from those expresse words of covenant, *In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely dye*.

We know not whether to thinke the ignorance of this man, or his impudence greater, in answering nothing to what we have fully layd downe against his Doctrines.

*Position 9. That no man that commits sin, or that is not perfectly holy, can ever enter into the Kingdome of Heaven, unless there be a Purgatory.*

*Except* *Nayler* thus excepts, *There is not a word to that purpose, as you have set downe,*

This



This is strange? Doth not he confesse there is this Quære in Reply. it? *Whether any imperfect one shall enter into the Kingdome of Heaven, yea, or no?* and if not, then how shall one dying in sinne; and where shall he be made perfect and cleane, seeing the tree must lye as it falls? and whether you owne a Purgatory, yea, or no? this he confesseth to be his words. And is there not a word (as he chargerh us) there to that purpose?

2. But the Reader must know, that what he there in that Booke layes downe by way of quary, must be looked upon as his positive assertions, as thou wilt see by the adjoyning quaries in the same page, where challenging those that are so much offended at perfection, he puts these quaries. 1. *Whether any imperfect one committing sinne be the Image of God, yea or no?* where a man may plainly see, he meanes such an one is not the Image of God. 2. *Whether any can witnesse the worke of Redemption compleat in them by Christ, while they commit sinne?* where it is evident he intends the negative. So in this quere, to resolve it into a proposition; we appeale to his conscience, or the judicious Reader, that whilest he puts this quere as a challenge to those that deny perfection in this life. *Whether any imperfect and unleave one that lives in sinne, shall enter into the Kingdome of Heaven, yea or no?* and if not, how shall one dying in sinne? and where shall he be made perfect and cleane, seeing the tree must lye as it falls? and whether you owne a Purgatory, or no? we dare appeale to them, we say, if it runne not thus by way of assertion. That no uncleane or imperfect man, can enter into the Kingdome of Heaven, unlesse there be a Purgatory to wash away his sins that dyes imperfect.

And now thou wilt see how unjustly this man rayles with open mouth, as if we were the most wicked lyars in the world, when the assertion is so evidently his owne, and will so appeare to any that hath but halfe an eye of common understanding.

He tells us, *They charge me to say, that no man that hath sinned can enter into the Kingdome, and as though I ownd a Purgatory.* Excep. 3

*Hath sinned*, what a miserable shuffle is this, and what a pitifull conscience hath this man? thy owne eyes Reader will informe thee, that we have not such a tittle in our Booke; we

Reply.  
Noles  
shuffling.

charge him to say, *No man that doth commit sinne, and is not perfectly holy, can enter into the Kingdom;* but who chargeth him to have said, *that no man that hath sinned, &c.* For charging him as if he owned a Purgatory its like the former; surely the man was put to a pinch, when he falls a doubling and shuffling so apparently. We say this must be his argument, *Either there must be a Purgatory to wash away the sinne of him that dyes imperfect, or else he can never enter into the Kingdom of God.* It seems *Nayler* knowes no other way, but a Purgatory to wash away his sinne that dyes imperfect. But we looke upon that clause, as the absurdity which *Nayler* thinks to run us upon, if we will pleade, that a man may dye imperfect and yet be saved, then we must owne a Purgatory; And so because he knew no other

*Quakers* way to wash away mens sins, but either by perfect holinesse here, *Popery.* or by a Purgatory, we found him out a medium, even the blood of the Lord *Iesus*, which cleanseth the soule (otherwise as to its personall actings, very guilty) from all sinne.

*Excep. 3* Against this he objects that Text, *1 Iohn 1. 7. Doth it say any are cleansed from sinne while they personally act sinne? or the quite contrary?*

*Repl'y.*  
*Naylers*  
*juggling*  
*with Scri-*  
*pture.*

How falsely doth *Nayler* deale with the Scripture, and imitate the Father of lyes; when Satan tempted *Christ*, *Mat. 4. 6.* to cast himselfe downe from the Temple, he takes that of Scripture that would be thought serve his purpose, and leaves out the rest; as may be seene by comparing it with *Psal. 91. 11. 12.* Just so deales *Nayler* with the Scripture and us, leaving out from that Scripture that which immediately followes, *If we say that we have no sinne we deceive our selves, and the truth is not in us;* which would fully have made out the mystery of perfect justification consisting with imperfect sanctification; its spoken of *Saints*, that are actually cleansed by the blood of *Christ*, and yet are told there is no truth in them; they make God a lyar, if they say we have no sinne. That Text beyond exception also, *Rom. 4. 5. To him that worketh not, but believeth in him that justifieth the ungedly, &c.* he is silent unto, according to his custome,

Position 10. *No real Saint but he that is perfect, and perfectly holy in this life, and doth not sinne.*

Our severall proofes, that this is their Principle, are not denied; but we are reviled for manifesting this to be an error from Scripture, though he hath not answered one of the many Scriptures we gave against this Doctrine.

The first reviling is this, *It seems there can be no greater Exception to you, than to cry downe sinne, and to grow up to perfection, &c. you pleade for continuance in sinne and imperfection, &c. you pleade for the Devils Kingdome, putting cleansing from sinne and perfection farre off till after death, &c.*

1. Reader, If thou hast read our Booke of the *Perfect Phari-  
sees*, thou wilt see, we fore-saw this language from them; where we told thee, we expect (from their former usage in this kinde) they will charge us with pleading for sinne, pag. 16. 17. where we shewd, that discovering the imperfections of the best Saints, lest they should live upon their owne righteousness, was no pleading for sin: and this we proved from the practice of Christ, (discovering the imperfection of the Churches) of the Spirit, rehearsing the faults of the Saints; of Paul crying out, of the body of his death. So that to discover it, is not to pleade for it, unlesse you will blaspheme the holy One of Israel. Had Nayler considered these Texts, he might have spared the labour to repeat againe a cavill so fully answered; but he answers nothing.

*Reply.*  
Deniall of  
perfection  
in this life  
is no plead-  
ing for sin.

2. But yet to make it more cleare, that to say, perfection in holinesse cannot be attain'd in this life, is not to pleade for sinne and for the Devils Kingdome: Consider first, The Kingdome of the Devill is not pleaded for there, where there is a pressing of a continuall wrastring and struggling in the power of Jesus Christ against it, which pressing is our constant practice to our people. For though it is plaine from Scripture, that in the utmost attainements of the people of God, still they see but in a glasse, darkely, 1 Cor. 13. and have not attain'd perfection, Psal. 3. 12. yet it is their duty to struggle and wrastring against the body of their death and to presse towards the mark, Phil. 3. 14. Again, doth the Physician meeting with a Patient

Telling a  
conceited  
perfection-  
nist of sin,  
is to deale  
faithfully  
vvith his  
soule.

in a consumption, who strongly conceives that he is in perfect health, though the Physitian demonstrate it, that there are such and such decays in his vitall parts, doth he by declaring this, *pleade for his sicknesse*? or rather by this means pleade for his use of effectuall means for his recovery? For, *the whole world is not a Physitian, but they that are sicke*: And Jesus Christ came *not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance*. Nay, will not all say rather, that the Physitian is more faithfull to the sick man, then he is to himselfe? and more an enemy to, and pleader against the sicknesse, then the man is that conceits he is sound and perfect? This is the very case betwixt *us* and *Nayler*. *Nayler* sayes, he is perfect; the *Quakers* say, they are perfect, *and without sinne*; we pleade and say, he is not perfect; nay, he cannot be perfect, while there is *such a body of death in him*, and such a plague of sinne running in his heart; we tell him, that he that *saieth he hath no sinne, is a liar, deceiveth himselfe, and maketh God a liar*, and so doe pleade with him (not as he maliciously would scandalize us, to lye still in that state, content to have the body of his death worke his will, but to goe out to the blood of Jesus Christ for cure, that iniquities may be pardoned, to fetch strength from the sinners of Christ, not from his light within him, against the bubbling up of corruptions in the heart, and presse towards the mark. Whether now pleade for sinne, *Nayler* or *we*? he that will beare of the Saints being sicke, or under any spirituall imperfection, or we, that demonstrate their sinne from Scripture, that so they may seeke after the healings of the blood of Jesus.

The spirit  
convicting  
of sin, doth  
not picture  
the sinne.

3. What is the designe of the discovery, and conviction of the finnes of men by the spirit of the living God? Is it to pleade for sinne? that singular office of the spirit, *Iohn 16*, *he shall convince the world of sinne*; when God doth set open secret sins, the secret finnes of Saints before their eyes, is it to set up the Kingdome of the Devill? What blasphemy may *Nayler* bring upon himself? or is it not evidently to pull down the throne of Satan, and the power of sinne, which never weakened in the soule, till it be discovered, and never raised more securely and effectually, then in the heart of him that

secure, and confident he is compleat and perfect, and sayes *Rev.*  
 3. 17. *I am rich, and increased with goods, and stand in need of  
 nothing, when he knowes not he is miserable, poore, blinde, and  
 naked.*

4. We shall adde no more but this, that pleading for this, <sup>pleading</sup>  
 that any of the sons of men are perfectly holy, and doe not sin, <sup>for perfec-</sup>  
 (which is the designe of *Nayler*) <sup>tion here,</sup> is ready to <sup>is a plead-</sup>  
 to set up and strengthen the barrs of the Kingdome of Satan. <sup>ing for sin,</sup>  
<sup>proved in</sup>  
<sup>seven par-</sup>  
<sup>ticulars.</sup>

1. That soule will never struggle after a better state, which  
 lives in a conceit of his perfection here, *Rev.* 3. 24. *hope that is  
 scene, is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope  
 for?* how doth this strengthen the Kingdome of darkenesse?  
 contrary to *Phil.* 3. 12. 13. 14. *Rom.* 8. 23. 2 *Cor.* 5. 2. 3.  
*Phil.* 1. 21. 22.

2. This is to cast a needlesse upon the pretious blood of *Iesus*,  
 tis a trampling under foot the blood by which we are justified,  
 our propitiation being through Faith in his blood, *Rom.* 3. 25.  
 What needs this fountain for sinne and uncleannesse, *Zach.*  
 13. 1. where there is no sinne? What need of a Saviour, where  
 there is no sinne? *the whole need no Physician,* *Mat.* 9. 12. and  
 what a wickednesse is this, to make the blood of *Christ* in vain?  
 and what is it, but as *Nayler* saith, to count the blood of the  
 Lord *Iesus* as a common thing? *Gal.* 3. 22.

3. Will such a soule ever goe out to pardoning promises?  
 and how doth Satan by such a Doctrine as this, at once destroy  
 the necessity of the blood and of the promises of *Iesus Christ*,  
 such as these, *Isay* 1. 18. *though your sinnes be as Scarlet, &c.*  
*Isay* 43. 25. *I am he that blotte out transgressions.* *Heb.* 8. 12.  
*Your sinnes and iniquities I will remember no more.* Is not this  
 evident from the practice of *Quakers*, both in their speaking  
 and writing? they never send these soules whom they call dam-  
 ned to the pardoning promises and blood of *Christ*; but to their  
 owne light to save them. What need of the promises of par-  
 don, when I have no sinne? and was it not the Pharisees sin,  
*Mat.* 15. 6. *Marke* 7. 13 *to make the command of God of none  
 effect?* and is it not much more the *Quakers* sin, to make voyd  
 the promises? *Rom.* 3. 3. *Rom.* 4. 14. So *Heb.* 2. 3. 3. *If the  
 Word spoken by Angels was steadfast, &c.* how shall we escape, if

*we neglect the Word, which at first began to be spoken by the Lord.*

4. Is not this also, this fancy of *perfection*, the great root of that great sinne against the Gospel, of *self-righteousnesse*? which the Apostles so much declares against, *Rom. 9. 31. 32. Rom. 10. 2. 3. Gal. 5. 4.* for such is the remaining pride that is in every one, that if they have any thing to glory in, they will set it up, as their Idoll in their hearts.

5. *How can sinne be mourned over, and mortified, when neither owned nor discovered.* We finde blessed *Paul*, a Saint, of another Principle then *James Nayler* pretends to, he, good man, complains of an *imperfect state*, *1 Cor. 13. 12. I see but in part*, he mourns over the body of his death. *Rom. 7. 24. Oh! wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me?* But how shall we expect this from such as hide their eyes from their bo-some sinnes? there can be no sense of an unseen, an unfelt, an unacknowledged sinne. What is the reason why so little mourning and mortifying? is it not blindness, and want of discerning sinne in the exceeding sinfulness of it in mens hearts.

6. This is to take away the end of Christs convincing men of sinne, which is, that free grace may superabound, *Rom. 5. 20.* What made *Paul* to cry out of the exceeding abundance of grace, *1 Tim. 1. 15.* but the exceedingness of his sinnes? *I am the chiefe of sinners.* *David*, though a man after Gods owne heart, yet the sight of his great sins, after he was in a justified state, this is that which makes him cry out to the multitude of Gods tender mercies for pardon. *Psal. 51. 1. according to thy loving kindnesse, according to the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my transgressions, &c.* How shall a Quaker see any glory in pardoning grace, as to its dayly coverings of their weaknesses, when they say, they are perfect, and doe not sinne at all.

The quakers sinnes discovered notwithstanding their piety and pleading for pardon.

7. This fancy of their *perfection*, is the hiding from their poore deluded soules of those sinnes, which they are evidently under the power of, in the eyes of any spiritual ob-server. For though they cry up their owne *perfections*, yet who knows not the sinfulness of their *self-righteousnesse*, of their many blasphemies,



*miser, Heretics, denying the Lord that bought them, raylings, pride, lying, reproaching of the precious Ordinances of the living God, and Messengers of Jesu? Alas, what observant eye doth not reade these evidently in their bookes, writings, words, behaviours? Now who knowes not, if Scripture be true, these are wofull corruptions, and damning sinnes? And shall their fancy of perfection be a covering to such abominations as these? No, no; the Prophet *Isaiah* will tell them otherwise, *Isa. 28. 20.* the bed is shorter then that a man can stretch himselfe on it, and the covering narrower then that he can wrap himselfe in it. Nay, their very pleading they are perfect, convinceth them of sin; For *Job* a man of excellency and holines, beyond any of them, saith, *chap. 9. 20. 21. If I justify my selfe, my owne mouth shall condemne me; if I say I am perfect, it shall also prove me perverse; though I were perfect, yet would I not know my soule.* But such broken reeds will one day pierce their hands, when the King of terrors shall arrest the body, and the sorrowes of death shall compasse them about, then their perfection will appeare to be a dreame. Oh! that *Nayler* would thinke of that of *Bellarmino*, who had long disputed for a perfection of holinesse; but when he came to dye, then he came to see somewhat of the raggs of his owne righteousness, and cryed out, *Lord have mercy on me, not according to my workings, but according to thy mercies in Jesu Christ.* Reader, if God ever open these mens eyes, they will then see the need of the blood of Christ, when the flames of wrath shall be burning up their straw and stubble: but if the spirit of slumber shall keep them in blindness and in bondage still, that they cannot see, and will not owne their imperfection: yet when Christ shall come in flaming fire, how shall their righteousness shrivell together as a scrowle, and be like stubble before the flame? then will the vanity of that *Quakers* expressions be layd open, *That holy and close walking with God, is a Saints covering from the wrath of God.* Oh! let the Reader, *Psal. 2. 12. Kisse the Sonne, lest he be angry; when his wrath is kindled but a little, blessed are all they that trust in him.**

As to this matter of perfection, the summe of the rest of his answer is to pleade for perfection here from these considerations.

*Thus*

That this is the end of Christs coming, is present in perfect that not one jot or tittle of the Law must passe, till all be fulfilled Rom. 8. 3. 4. That God sent his Sonne, that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, and to dispute against perfection here, is to make the commands of Christ, and endeavours of the Saints, of none effect.

Reply.

1 Iohn 3. 8. *vis*, 1 Iohn. 3. 8. and to this end was made manifest. We answered, 1. Christ destroyed the workes of the Devill for his people, upon the Crosse. Col. 2. 14. 15, and having spoiled Principalities and Powers; he made a shew of them openly triumphing over them in it. Heb. 2. 14. Christ himselfe took part of flesh and blood, that by death he might destroy him that had the power of death, viz. the Devill. Doe we then by denying perfection of inherent holinesse in this life, make voyd the end of Christs coming, thus to destroy the workes of the Devill? nay, we establish it; for by discovering of *imperfection*, we send them to glory alone in Christ crucified, Gal. 6. 14. 2. Christ destroys the workes of the Devill in his people also; and this is the constant carrying on of mortification in their hearts, with his owne spirit whereby he takes away the dominion and raigne of sinne. Rom. 6. 14. As in Paul, who though he had the spirit of Christ, and the dominion of sinne removed, and Christ dayly destroying the workes of the Devill in him; yet still he had a Law in his members, warring against the Law of his minde, Rom. 7. 23. yet there was the spirit lusting against the flesh, and the flesh against the spirit. Thus Christ exerciseth his conquering power in the conflicts of his Saints. Now though sinne in Paul where not wholly removed, or destroyed at present, yet did not Christ lose this end of his being made manifest. For first, as he had it in part in his dayly conquering. So secondly, he will have it in fulnesse, in his owne appointed time, when the soule shall see him face to face, then that which is in part shall be done away, and not till then; as is cleare, 1 Cor. 13. p. 10. 3. There are ends of Christs being made manifest, which are not voyd, because they are not fulfilled in this world, such as, the putting of the Saints into the possession of his fulnesse of glory, the putting of all his enemies under

under his feet, &c. so that *perfection in holiness* being one of these things, that are reserved for a state of glory, we doe not destroy the end of Christs comming, when we pleade he shall attaine this end *in his owne appointed time*; and though the most holy here are full of many infirmities, yet the day shall be when the workes of Satan shall be destroyed in them altogether, in the time appointed by the Father: the *Quakers* may as well say, because the Saints are not now in glory, therefore Christ hath lost his end in dying. What we have said to this, both in Christs satisfying for soules, whereby he presents them perfect as to justification, as also his destroying at death the whole body of sinne, when they enter into a perfect state of glory, will shew the vanity of his second plea; for though we be not perfectly holy in our selves in this life, yet we are perfect as to justification, and compleat in him, *Col. 2. 10.* and though the Saints be not compleatly holy at present; yet the day is comming when they shall, even the time appointed by him that dyed for it, and purposeth to present us spotlesse *as his owne*; so that Christ loseth not the end of his comming.

As to his third, that *Mat. 5. 18. not one jot or tittle of the Law shall passe till all be fulfilled*; which he brings to prove *perfection* in the Saints, thus; First. It is evident that he that is there spoken of in *v. 17.* as fulfilling the Law is, the Lord Iesus. *I came to fulfill it*; and that was solely and alone the worke of Christ, both as he was the accomplishment of Prophecies, *in the Law, or Booke of Scripture*, as he was the substance of all shadows in the Law ceremoniall; and as he in Person, did exactly as Mediator performe all the duties of the Law Morall, that so by his obedience, many might be made righteous. What, is this to prove *perfection* in the Saints, because Christ fulfilled all righteousness.

3. But the naturall and proper sense of this Text is clearly another businesse; Christ is speaking here, that the Law, or the word of command and prophecies shall stand good and sure; the word here is interpreted in the repetition of them, *Luke 16. 17. not one jot shall fall*; so here, not one tittle shall passe from *the Law*, it shall stand good and entire in it selfe; Christ is not speaking as if the Law should be compleatly fulfilled and

obeyed by us; it shall stand in its force and authority, notwithstanding that I am come; yet I came not to destroy it, but to continue it in its truth, entirenesse and authority: like that *Rom. 3. 31. Doe we then make voyd the Law through Faith? nay, we establish it.* And that *Isay 40. 48. repeated 1 Peter 1. 25. the grasse withereth, and the flower thereof fadeth, but the Word of the Lord abideth for ever.* And what a non-sensicall reason is this, to prove that the Saints are perfect here, and doe perfectly fulfill the Law, because the Law shall not lose a tittle of its authority and entirenesse?

Rom. 8. 4.  
opened.

3. His third plea to prove the perfection of holinesse in this life is, *Rom. 8. 4. that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us.* To which we answer. First, The Apostle here *ver. 1.* is speaking of justification, *there is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Iesum.* *Ver. 3.* he layes downe whence that freedome from condemnation flowes, and tells you, *that what the Law could not doe, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his owne Sonne in the likeness of sinfull flesh, for sin, (viz. by a sacrifice for sinne, or to satisfie for sinne) condemned sinne in the flesh.* that is, when man could not be justified by reason that sinfull flesh could not satisfie the Law, God sent his Sonne to satisfie for sinne, that so the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us. So that though we personally cannot, and could not performe it; yet, through our union with Christ, being *dead with Christ, Col. 2. 20. quickned with him, Ephes. 2. 5. we have his righteousness fulfilled in us.* Thou wilt further understand that this place is meant of the righteousness of Christ satisfying and fulfilling the righteousness of the Law, and so made ours by our union with him, if thou consider these observations,

1. It is no where said in all the Booke of God, that the righteousness of the Law is fulfilled in this life in any Saint, as to inherent holinesse; nay the contrary is here asserted *ver. 3. the Law was weak through Faith.* As also, *Rom. 3. 20. that a man is not justified by the workes of the Law &c.* 2. It is Beza's note, that the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled, *in hunc, in us; not apud hunc, not of us, or by us.* 3. Is not this to goe about to confirme justification by inherent holinesse,

against

against which you have had such undeniable proofe. 4. What is this, but to build up the old Popish notion of justification by inherent holinesse. 5. If any shall thinke that latter expression (*who walkes not after the flesh, but after the spirit*) shall tye this, fulfilling of the Law in us to *sanctification*, we referre him to the first verse, where the same words are used; and yet they are onely layd downe as a description of the Persons to whom there is no condemnation; as they are layd downe also as a description of these persons that enjoy the fruite of that glorious worke of Christ fulfilling the Law, and satisfying it. So that this Text onely holds forth the satisfaction of the Law by Iesus Christ to be made really ours by our union with him, as fully as if it had been performed in our owne persons. But as to justification by inherent holinesse, or perfection of it in this life, we have fully proved the contrary.

Lastly, He tells us we looked upon it as a strange thing, that *Farnsworth* should say, *No unclean thing can enter into the Kingdoms of Heaven*. When as, that which we say, is no such thing, but a challenging of *Farnsworth* his ignorance of the Gospel, that he can see no consistency with these two, *A Saint cannot be perfect here; And no unclean thing can enter into the Kingdoms of God*. Is this to count the Scripture a strange thing? or is it not *Farnsworths* grosse ignorance, that he knows no way of entering into glory, unlesse he be perfect before he dye? Is he not grossely ignorant of the maine mystery of justification by the blood of Christ? May not a man be in part, unclean, by reason of the imperfection of his present holines, and yet pure and spotlesse too, as to justification, by reason of the imputation of the obedience of him, who is the Lord our righteousness. This Reader, is their great *Idoll* and *Diana*, and therefore thou wilt pardon our tediousnesse, and clearly see how blinde these men are as to Gospel righteousness.

**Position 11.** *That every man in the world hath a light within him sufficient to guide him to salvation, without the help of any outward light or discovery.*

In his answer to this Position, he denies none of our proofs; but adds his further profession of the same Principle, in these

words; *All the World shall witness against you, that they have a light that lets them see when they sinne, which if they did see, and obey, would send out of sinne unto Christ &c.*

**Encomp.** The maine part of his answer is by way of rayling; all that he speaks to make good this Position is, *that Christ is the true light, and that he enlighteneth every man, and that where he is, there need no outward discovery.*

**Repl.** For the first, that Christ is the *true light*, is confessed on all hands; but that Iesus Christ is in every man, or gives a saving light to every man, we utterly deny: and we have plentifully proved in our answer to the fourth Position. The first Text he proves it by, is, *Iohn 1. 9. He is the true light that lightneth every one.* We have fully opened this Text in our answer to the fourth Position, and convincingly shewed, it is not meant at all of any Gospel saving light, where we desire the Reader to satisfie himselfe at large. For his second, *Iohn 8. 12. I am the*

**Io. 8. 12.** *light of the World, he that followes me shall not walke in darknesse.* This proves not that Christ doth give a saving light to the whole world; no more then that Text, *1 Iohn 2. 2* doth prove that the whole world shall have the benefit of Christs propitiation. Secondly, the words immediately following, might satisfie *Nayler*, that he is thus a saving light onely to them that follow him, who are Beleevers, drawne by the power of the spirit of God. *Can. 1. 4. No man comes to me except the Father draw me.* *Iohn 6. 44. 45. Every man that hath heard and learned of the Father, cometh to me:* So that Christ is onely the light of those that have learned of the Father, and have been drawne by the Father, and follow him. Here is a cleare restriction of Christs being a light, onely to Beleevers, to them that follow him &c. The third Scripture, *Iohn 1. 4. 5. the*

**Io. 1. 4. 5.** *light shined in darknesse, and the darknesse comprehended it not;* is cleare against him. For the Phrase of the *light shined in darknesse*, imports onely, that Iesus Christ was Preached to them, Christ came amongst them, and *Iohn* Preached him to them. *Rev. 29. Behold the Lambe of God, &c.* yet they were in darknesse, for want of light they could not so much as discover him, nor receive him; so farre were they from knowing Christ, or the world from having Christ a light in them all, that they could



could not apprehend him, when he was Preached openly to them. His fourth Text is, *John 3. 19. this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, is as full against Naylor, as the former: for it speaks this, that Jesus Christ is the true light, was Preached to the World and discovered to them, when he had before been a mystery, hid from Ages and Generations, Col. 1. 26. yet they would not beleve him, but loved to continue in that darkenesse, or ignorance of Christ, which is in all by nature.*

Now for the third branch of his answer, *that where this light of Christ is, there need no outward discovery.* We answer, 1. We have abundantly proved, that Jesus Christ is not in all, in our answer to his reply to the fourth Position. 2. We have also proved, That Jesus Christ neither is in all, nor doth he enlighten all, by giving every man a knowledge of the Gospel; this we have done at large in the same place. 3. We have fully proved, that all men in the world doe need an outward light or discovery, and that it is the way of Christ his making knowne himselfe by outward discovery, and Preaching the Gospel, in the *Perfekt Pharisee*, pag. 18. 19. in six arguments, to which *Naylor* answers nothing. All that he brings for it *de novo*, in his answer, is onely his bare word, without either argument or text; so that we need to say no more. Yet, *ex abundanti*, we shall adde. First, It was the wisdom of the Father to have the Gospel Preached to every creature, and therefore did he send men forth to publish it, *Marke 16. 15. Mat. 28. 19. 30.*

Necessity  
of outward  
teaching,  
further  
proved.

2. It pleased the Father to owne Preaching of the Gospel, with the conversion of soules. *Acts 2. 41. 1 Cor. 1. 21. It pleased God by the foolishness of Preaching, to save them that beleeve*

3. It pleased the Lord Iesus, when he was ascended up to Heaven, to give officers for the perfecting of the Saints. *Ephes. 4. 11. 13. for the edifying of the body of Christ.*

4. It pleased him also to establish this as an everlasting Ordinance to continue till the end of all things. *Mat. 28. last. Ephes. 4. 13.* He that hath any sence of the wisdom of God, and submission to it, will not dare to say with *Naylor*, *that every man hath a light within him, sufficient without the help of*  
any

any outward discovery, or to charge folly in doing all this upon him, whose wisdom is admired, infinite, and affecteth nothing needlessly, and in vaine? But what dare not these men doe, who dare list up themselves in their blasphemous pride, to be as pure as God,

1 Pet. 1. 19.  
apace &  
vindicated.

There is one Scripture, 1 Peter 1. 19. which is not brought by *Nayler* by way of prooffe, but is most ignorantly wrested by him, to this their Idoll, of *light within*. We hinted how little the man had of any knowledge of Scripture, by his so blinde, and pittifull abusing this Text, in that former Booke, *Perfekt Pharisee*, p. 19. We see he is yet as confident as he was; we shall onely say, that which is there called, *the sure Word of Prophecie*, 1 Peter 1. 19. is that word of Prophecie, which in old time holy men of God spake, &c. v. 21. and to this he bids them take heed, viz. to the Doctrine of the Prophets; where *Peter* doth not send them to the light within them, but to the Bookes and Words of the Prophets, as *Christ* sends the Jewes to the same Scriptures, *John* 3. 39. Nay, the Text is so farre from hinting any *light within*, that the Apostle tells you, these words of the Prophets were *Argvs* *testamentum*, a more sure Word then the voyce that came from Heaven, ver. 17. Thus the man hath kill the weakenesse to produce Scripture, that fully destroyes his owne Principle.

We shall adde no more, but from these words of *Naylers*, *Where this light of Christ is, there needs no outward discovery*, with the Reader to observe, That it is not onely the Publishing of the Gospel, by the Ministry that *Nayler* cries downe in this as uselesse, but also the very Scriptures, the written word it selfe (being an outward discovery) must by the same reason be asserted needlesse. Here is the Religion of these men that pretend so much to perfection, and yet will not heare God in his Word.

Position 12. That there is no need of any outward teaching by Reading or Hearing the Scriptures opened or applied, &c.

The Reader by his answer may observe, there is nothing said against our many prooffes; onely one shuffle about the expressions

pressions of *John Audland*, who we said affirmed, *No need of outward teaching*, which *Nayler* says is false; for the words were, *He needed no man to teach him*; What a shuffle is this? or, doth this deny what we say? doth he not say, *no need of outward teaching to himselfe*? But *Nayler* hath this but by report, and the words were spoken in our hearing. *Nayler* also (we observed in the last Position) asserts the same fully, in these words, *Where this light of Christ is, there needs no outward light or discovery, &c.* the rest of his answer, is the grossest heape of rayling and lying, as we have seen. His rayling will appeare to all that reads it, and his lying is as full; For he saith, *These promises you give to them that are in the first birth, sow pillows under every arme-hole; you Preach them up all Believers, except some that refuse to give you hire, and them you prepare warre against; you say men must commit sinne while they live, &c.* who knowes not that knoweth us, the fallenesse of these lyes, which he speakes out so freely, as if they were as true as could be. But as their wickednesse is fully knowne, so the Lord will in due time discover what shall be given to a false tongue.

There is onely produced by him these Scriptures, *Ier. 31. 31. Except. 32. 33. Heb. 8. 10. 11.* they are both the same, *They shall teach no more every man his neighbour, or saying, Know the Lord &c.*

We answer, That this promise doth only concerne the children of God, as *Nayler* himselfe confesseth also, it concernes them onely.

1. The children of God onely are in everlasting covenant in the new covenant. 2. They that shall be thus taught, are such as have their sinnes pardoned. Will *Nayler* say, that every man hath his sinne pardoned? he may as well affirme, that all have their sins pardoned, as affirme that this promise belongs to all. So that as in the point of pardon, all flesh must signifie not every man; so it must be restrained also in the point of teaching, to those all that are the people of God, and are interested in the mercy of this everlasting covenant.

3. Though these people of God be thus taught of God; yet this excludes not the use of outward teaching. Reader, besides the evidences of this we gave thee in foure arguments under our reply to his answer to the eleventh Position; If thou wouldst

That great  
promise in  
Jer. 31. 31.  
opened at  
large.

would take the paines to reade what we have Written in the *Perfett Pharisee*, pag. 21. 22. in which we have convinced the needlesse of outward teaching, even to the best of Saints, by plentifull arguments, and above thirty undeniable, plaine, evident Scriptures, thou wilt be fully satisfied; and therefore we shall not trouble thee to repeat what we have said; onely in a few words to open the meaning of the expression, we shall adde,

1. Know this promise was made good when the Saints were under outward teachings, when the Apostles Preached, when Elders were set over the Churches, when *Faith came by hearing*, Rom. 10. For in those times the spirit was abundantly powred forth; yea, then was the time, when their Sons and Daughters Prophesied; so that it is a promise consistiing with outward teaching. 2. With how much willingesse did the Saints, when enjoying this promise, attend the Apostles Doctrine, *Acts* 2. 41. 3. Why doth the Apostle write to the *Hebrewes* to reach them, if that were the meaning, that no man should reach his neighbour. 4. Nay, doth he not say, *Heb. 5. 12. Ye have need that one teach you againe which be the first Principles of the Oracles of God.* 5. Paul blames them for their forsaking their Church-assemblies, *Heb. 10. 25.* Yea 6. Commands these Hebrews, *Remember them that have the rule over you, who have spoken to you the Word of God,* Heb. 13. 7. And 7. *1 Thim. ver. 3. It was needfull for me to write unto you, and exhort you.* 8. Paul speaking of himselfe as to his Ministry, sayes, *Phil. 1. 24. to continue in the flesh is more needfull for you;* and what was it for? but as to their instruction, So that it plainly appeares, this is not spoken to exclude outward Teachings, but are to shew the abundance of spirituall Knowledge and light in Gospel-times, comparatively with the dispensation the Iewes were under, before the comming of the Lord Iesus. But we have abundantly proved the sense is not, cannot be, to take away the needfulnesse of outward teaching.

**VVarrant**  
for division  
of Scri-  
pture into  
chapter  
and verse.

To excuse *George Fox* his juggling in a Concordance, he saith to abuse the division of Scriptures into Chapters and Verses. It seems he hath a minde to cast all the dirt he can upon any outward light, though it be the Scriptures, and though for no-  
thing

thing but this, and he saith, *the Hireling Priests have done it to trade withall*; thus doth he ignorantly rayle, though the Old Testament was so divided and distinguished long before the coming of Christ, by the *Masorites* into chapter and verse, about two hundred yeares before the coming of our Saviour; and the most Learned say, that they were that Ecclesiasticall Senate, held by *Ezra, Haggai, Zachariah, and Malacky*, with divers others; who amongst others their eminent services, distinguished the Scriptures into sections and verses. And as we finde none of the Apostles, nor Christ himsef disallowing that division; so the Saints of God in our dayes, have found pretious advantage by thus methodizing Scripture, though this man revile it under the name of the worke of Hirelings.

How he shufls in the rest about the Apostles Preaching and ordaining Elders, will informe thee fully how the man was puzzled in that businesse: and his last expressions of saying, we tell men, *they must commit sinne*, will informe thee of his maliciousnesse. He would insinuate to the Reader, as if we pressed men to sinne. We have said so much of this, that we shall adde no more, having fully cleared, our pressing to all, yea to the best, to strive after greater degrees of holinesse dayly, and that they must struggle after that perfection, which yet they doe not enjoy; but we see the man is vexed and so we leave him to calme his spirits. We have been very full also as to prove the necessity of teaching, to which thou mayst observe he answers nothing, and thereby see the spirit of those men, that doe stop their eyes against the plainest light; but he that hardeneth his heart shall not prosper.

Position 13. *That the Scriptures are not the Word of God, but a Declaration of the conditions of them that spoke them forth.*

He answers nothing, according to his custome, to our arguments, nor excepts against our proofes, but labours to confirme the Position.

*Christ is the Word; now if the Scriptures be the Word, then Excep.<sup>t</sup> there is two Words of God, now prove that in Scripture, or that the Letter is called the Word in plaine words.*

would take the paines to reade what we have Written in the *Perfekt Pharisee*, pag 21. 22. in which we have convinced the needlesse of outward teaching, even to the best of Saints, by plentifull arguments, and above thirty undeniable, plaine, evident Scriptures, thou wilt be fully satisfied; and therefore we shall not trouble thee to repeate what we have said; onely in a few words to open the meaning of the expression, we shall adde,

1. Know this promise was made good when the Saints were under outward teachings, when the Apostles Preached, when Elders were set over the Churches, when *Faith came by hearing*, Rom. 10. For in those times the spirit was abundantly poured forth; yea, then was the time, when their Sons and Daughters Prophefied; so that it is a promise consistiing with outward teaching. 2. With how much willingnesse did the Saints, when enjoying this promise, attend the Apostles Doctrine, *Acts* 2. 42. 3. Why doth the Apostle write to the *Hebrewes* to teach them, if that were the meaning, that no man should teach his neighbour. 4. Nay, doth he not say, *Heb* 5. 12. *You have need that one teach you againe which be the first Principles of the Oracles of God*. 5. Paul blames them for their forsaking their Church-assemblies, *Heb* 10. 25. Yea 6. Commands these Hebrews, *Remember them that have the rule over you, who have spoken to you the Word of God*, *Heb* 13. 7. And 7. *Remember*, 3. *It was needfull for me to write unto you, and exhort you*. 8. Paul speaking of himselfe as to his Ministry, sayes, *Phil* 1. 24. *to continue in the flesh is more needfull for you*; and what was it for? but as to their instruction, So that it plainly appeares, this is not spoken to exlude outward Teachings, but are to shew the abundance of spirituall Knowledge and light in Gospel-times, comparatively with the dispensations the Iewes were under, before the comming of the Lord Iesus. But we have abundantly proved the sense is not, cannot be, to take away the needfulnesse of outward teaching.

VVarrant  
for division  
of Scripture  
into  
chapter  
and verse.

To excuse *George Fox* his juggling in a Concordance, he saith to abuse the division of Scriptures into Chapters and Verses: It seems he hath a minde to cast all the dirt he can upon any outward light, though it be the Scriptures, and though for no  
this]



thing but this, and he saith, *the Hsreling Priests have done it to trade withall*; thus doth he ignorantly rayle, though the Old Testament was so divided and distinguished long before the coming of Christ, by the *Masorites* into chapter and verse, about two hundred yeares before the coming of our Saviour; and the most Learned say, that they were that Ecclesiasticall Senate, held by *Ezra, Haggai, Zachariah, and Malachy*, with divers others; who amongst others their eminent services, distinguished the Scriptures into sections and verses. And as we finde none of the Apostles, nor Christ himsefse disallowing that division; so the Saints of God in our dayes, have found precious advantage by this methodizing Scripture, though this man revile it under the name of the worke of Hsrelings.

How he shufls in the rest about the Apostles Preaching and ordaining Elders, will informe thee fully how the man was puzzled in that businesse: and his last expressions of saying, we tell men, *they must commit sinne*, will informe thee of his maliciousnesse. He would insinuate to the Reader, as if we pressed men to sinne. We have said so much of this, that we shall adde no more, having fully cleared our pressing to all, yea to the best, to strive after greater degrees of holinesse dayly, and that they must struggle after that perfection, which yet they doe not enjoy; but we see the man is vexed and so we leave him to calme his spirits. We have been very full also as to prove the necessity of teaching, to which thou mayst observe he answers nothing, and thereby see the spirit of those men, that doe stop their eyes against the plainest light; but he that hardeneth his heart shall not prosper.

Position 13. *That the Scriptures are not the Word of God, but a Declaration of the conditions of them that spoke them forth.*

He answers nothing, according to his custome, to our arguments, nor excepts against our proofes, but labours to confirme the Position.

*Christ is the Word; now if the Scriptures be the Word then Except there is two Words of God, now prove that in Scripture, or that the Letter is called the Word in plaine words.*

**Reply.** 1. That Christ is *the Word*, is plaine, *Iohn 1.* and who know-  
eth it not,

The essen-  
tiall and  
declarative  
Word, not  
all one, 2. That the will of God contained in the Scripture, is the  
*Word of God*, is as plaine, besides the Scriptures we named in  
the *Perfekt Pharisee*, pag. 24. *Marke 7. 13. Luke 11. 28. Rom.*  
*10. 17. Iohn 12. 48.* we shall adde these; *Luke 8. 11. the Seed*  
*is the Word of God*, ver. 12. *then commeth the Devill and taketh*  
*the word out of their hearts. least they should believe and be*  
*saved*; can the Devill take Christ out of their hearts? *1 Thes.*  
*2. 13. When yee received the Word of God which you heard of*  
*us, yee received it not as the Word of Men, but as it is in truth*  
*the Word of God &c.* This was the Word which the Apostles  
spake; yea, received it, which cannot be meant of Christ; he  
should have said, yee received him, not as the word of men, but  
as it is in truth the word of God. This is so plaine a case, we  
shall not trouble thee further. And here thou mayst observe  
there are two words of God; the essentiall and the declarative,  
and wonder the man should be so weake as to bid us produce  
Scripture to prove this, when the Scripture is so full of it to  
any that doth but read it.

**Excep.** 3. The Apostle calls what he wrote a Declaration, *1 Iohn 1. 2. 3.*

**Reply.** How doth this prove the Scriptures are not the word of God?  
nay, doth it not fully prove the contrary? for that which he de-  
clares was what he had heard of the Lord Iesus. Again, we  
doe owne the Scriptures, to be the declarative Word of God,  
or a declaration of the minde of God; but we say, the *Qua-*  
*kers* doe destroy the Scriptures Divinity and authority, when  
they call them *only* a declaration of the conditions of them  
that spoke them forth. For as we proved before, 1. They shall  
be then no foundation for the Faith of Saints; for one mans  
condition is not the foundation of another mans Faith. 2. The  
Scripture shall have no authority over the soule of any, but he  
that is in the same condition, and hath experienced it, con-  
trary to *Iohn 2. 4. 8.* this is the reason why *Nayler* sayes, they  
are not commanded to forbear to weare shoes in his Book, p. 21.  
if they were, they should, as well as they are commanded, *100*  
*to salute*; whereas that command (if it be in any part binding)  
*Luke 10. 4.* requires both; but this will tell thee, what is meant  
by

Scriptures  
not onely a  
declarat-  
ion of the  
conditions  
of Saints.

by their calling Scripture a speaking forth of the Saints condition. viz. it shall have no authority over them further then they list, or have an impulse on their spirits, or they practice; for both the commands are of equall authority, yet he denyes they are commanded one of them: nay they are both in the same verse *Luke 10. 4.* Yea 3. This destroyes the divine authority of all Historicall and Prophetickall Scripture, which could not be the Saints conditions when they spoke them; as also threatnings and promises &c. But see this at large *Perfect Pharisee*, pag. 24. 25. We shall say but this, 1 *John 5. 16.* *There is a sinne unto death, I doe not say that you should pray for it.* Was this *Iohns* condition when he spoke it? did he experience in his heart that he had sinned to death? 2 *Pet. 2. 12.* *The Dog is returned to his vomit, &c.* Was this the condition of *Peter* that spoke it? but we are ashamed of this wickednesse and folly of these men.

VWhereas you say, it cannot be understood to be the word *Excep. 3* Christ that came to the Prophets *Samuel, Jeremy, &c.* it seems your understanding is not with the Apostolic who saith, *It was the Spirit of Christ that was in them*, 1 *Peter 1. 11.* and you say, what Christ and his Apostles preached, &c. was not Christ, the Father, or Spirit, when as the Scripture saith, *Holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the holy Ghost*, 2 *Per. cap. 1. ver. 21.*

1. Consider Reader, how grossely he abuseth and perverts *Reply.* the Scripture, to prove that the words that they spoke were Christ and the spirit, because it is said, These holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the holy Ghost. What a grosse and blasphemous contending is here of the word that those men spoke, and the holy Ghost that moved them to speake; making the word spoken by a finite creature, to be the everlasting spirit, the holy Ghost? The words were committed to Paper and Inke, *Rev. 1. Hab. 2. 2.* engraven in Tables, 1 *Cor. 3. 7.* *Isay 39. 8.* write it before them in a Booke, note it in a Booke, &c. can this be Christ, or the Spirit of God? and yet these are the things which they were moved of the holy Ghost to write. Who knoweth not that it was the spirit of God that moved them to write, that revealed the things they were to

The Quakers grosse contending of Christ with the written Word.

publish to the world? but were those things that the holy Ghost moved them to write, were those things Christ? were those things the spirit? What a miserable ignorance, or judicial blindness is this, which certainly the righteous judgement of God hath given up this Generation of people to, because they received not the truth in the love thereof, that they might be saved.

**Position 14.** *That the Spirits are not to be tryed by the Scriptures, &c.*

This Position is not denyed by *Nayler*; we proved it from three testimonies, and *Nayler* in his answer addes his owne defence thereof without exception, against any of our proofes. We shall take his arguments for defence thereof in order.

**Excep. 1** *The infallible spirit, which is the originall of all Scriptures, is the tryall of all spirits, and that spiritual man judgeth all things, and by that spirit the Saints was to judge of all spirits, and gave those up to Satan that was for that end; as is plaine, 1 Cor. 5. 4.*

**Reply 1**

The spirit  
not to be  
set in op-  
position to  
Scripture.

The force of this argument by which he would prove that spirits are not to be tryed by Scripture. lyeth thus; *The infallible spirit is the tryall of all spirits; therefore spirits are not to be tryed by Scriptures.* To which we reply, That this is no consequence at all, and shall demonstrately prove it from these severall arguments.

1. To set the minde and will of the spirit in opposition to the spirit it selfe, can be no Gospel argument. For the Scriptures are the infallible will of the spirit, layd downe as the rule of Saints beleeving, judging, and walking. What a reproach had it been, when the spirit of God sent the Prophets to reveale his will? or when Jesus Christ sent the Jewes to search the Scriptures, what a reproach had it been to the living God, for them to have answered, We will not be judged, nor will we judge of spirits or doctrines by that *Word or Scripture*, we will stand to the judgement of the spirit it selfe, opposing the spirit it selfe to its owne will? How wicked a thing had it been in them? and how ridiculous an answer is this in *Nayler*?

2. How is this to undervalue the wisdom of the holy Ghost

Ghost himselfe; *Acts* 17. 11. who judgeth and pronounceth the *Bereans* more Noble then those of *Thessalonica* in that they searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things that were spoken by Paul and Silas were so, or no; in that they searched the Scriptures; the Spirit prizeth them, for trying the Doctrines of Paul and Silas by the Scripture as the written Word. And how wicked a thing is this in the *Quakers* to cry downe this trying of spirits, and Doctrines of Scriptures, which the spirit expressly ownes with such a signall testimony, as speaking out in the soule such a spirituall noblenesse.

3. It is confessed on all hands, that the eternall Spirit is the originall of Scriptures, and the tryer of Spirits; who ever questioned that? But our question is, what the Saints are to try the spirits by? not whether the spirit can try the Doctrines; No. But we affirme, that this eternall Spirit, hath left the written Word, as that which shall be the discovery, touchstone, and tryall of spirits, and Doctrines by authority and divine warrant from himselfe. See *2 Pet.* 1. 21. *Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the holy Ghost.* *2 Tim.* 3. 16. *All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, &c.* *John* 5. 99. *Search the Scriptures.* *Isay* 8. 20. &c. So that our asserting the Scriptures to be tryall of spirits, is but setting up the spirit in his owne authority and throne, over the spirits and consciences of men, and pleading with men that the spirit may rule in his owne way, and that they will try Doctrines by that Scripture which the holy Ghost commands them to try the Doctrines by. And he that refuseth that touchstone which the spirit hath layd downe for tryall, doth destroy the authority of the holy Ghost, let him speake sanctifically of trying by the spirit what he will. But this reasoning of *Naylers*, is as if when the Lord Protector should declare what is treason by Law, in publique Proclamations, a Justice of Peace should, when a Person were proved before him guilty of treason, according to that Law; yet should say, he is not to judge what is treason according to that Law, but he would appeals from the Law, to himselfe for what is treason, though the Law had determined it before.

But in this case, to exclude the Scriptures, because the holy Ghost is the originall of them, is to destroy that plaine truth,  
*Subordinata*

*Subordinata non pugnant*, things that act in a subordination, though about the same thing, doe not destroy one anothers usefulness or causality. Nay, the spirits being the Originall of all *Scripture*, this being confessed, doth necessarily confesse their divine authority, for that trying of spirits for which they were given forth by the inspiration of God.

2. As to that expression, *the spirituall man judgeth all things*, we have fully spoken before in pag. 79. We know there is a spirit of discerning which Believers have of Gospel mysteries; but what absurdity is this to inferre, therefore spirits are not to be tryed by *Scriptures*? For that light which a spirituall man hath, is a Scripture light.

1 Cor. 5. 4.  
opened.

3. How ignorantly is that 1 Cor. 5. 4. produced to prove this assertion, when Paul sayes, *In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ when you are gathered together, and my spirit, so destroye such an one to Satan, &c.* Paul is not trying of spirits, or judging of *Doctrines*, but exhorting the Church to excommunicate the incestuous Person; and tells them, That his *Apostolical* power shall goe along with them in that sentence. The verie going before, tells you what is the meaning of *his spirit*, where he sayes, *I am absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath done this deed*; that is, I in this Epistle doe send you my mind and my judgement, what you ought to doe with this man that hath committed Incest, as fully as if I were present with you, and so you may goe on at your meeting to excommunicate him, having for so doing, not onely the authoring of the Lord Jesus, but also the consent and judgement of me his Apostle. This is that in those words, *In the name of the Lord Jesus, and my Spirit*. How doth this man heape up quotations, without any understanding of the minde of the spirit in them; and with what exceeding ignorance doth he apply such Texts to his absurdities, as neither prove them, nor speake a little concerning them.

**Excep.<sup>2</sup>** *By this spirits were the spirits tryed, before the letter was; therefore spirits are not to be tryed by Scriptures.*

**Reply.** What a miserable *non sequitur* is here. There was a time when the spirit had not given forth the *Written Word*; therefore



fore when the spirit doth give forth a written Word, it is not to be regarded. There was a time when the Law was not engraven in Tables of Stone, therefore when it was engraven, the Israelites must not looke upon it as a rule of life, or judgement. There was a time when the will of God was not written, was not Scripture; therefore when Christ bids you search the Scriptures, you need not heed them at all. But we leave the Reader to laugh at this absurd consequence. The *Berens* judged by another light then *James Nayler* doth, who though they knew there was a time when Scripture was not written, yet they tryed the spirits and doctrines of *Paul* and *Silas* by the Scriptures. And the Spirit it self inspired and moved holy men of God to write the Scriptures, to leave them as a tryall and touchstone of spirits, though once there was a time when there was no written word. But oh! how doth God insatuate men, when they will not submit to the authority of his Word.

He falls a rayling exceedingly, and sayes, *We have no guide but the letter (because we assert the authority of Scripture)* and addes, *how many minds, how many formes, how many gods doe ye worship? and all pretend Scripture.* If it be possible to rake up a reason out of a heape of rayling, this it is; Those that doe uphold the Scriptures to be the tryall of Doctrines, doe yet differ amongst themselves; therefore the *Spirits* or *Doctrines* are not to be tryed in Scripture. Excep. 3

This, as many other of their answers, is a knowne thread. *Reply* bare Popish argument: they say, *You Protestants cannot agree in your Discipline, and therefore, the Scriptures are not to be the judge of Doctrines, but the infallible spirit of the Pope.* We hope God will discover them ere long to be men meerely acted by the spirit of Anti-christ; but we shall give you a full answer under these two considerations.

1. First, as it reflects upon our selves: We say, to differ in discipline, is not to worship severall gods (as *Nayler* rayles) while it is knowne we hold the head the Lord Jesus; but this we looke upon as the spitting of his venome. When *Peter* was for Circumcision, and *Paul* was against Circumcision, *Gal. 2. 13. 14.* did they worship severall gods? So those *Airs* 1<sup>st</sup>. that contested in different judgements, did they worship severall gods? Difference in non-fundamentals, no prejudice to the Scriptures being judge of spirits.

gods? But this man cares not what he sayes, so he may throw his dirt upon us, though he bewray his excessive ignorance in it before the world.

2. At it fights against the Scriptures, being the judge and tryall of spirits, we shall shew there is no strength in this exception at all. For the Scripture loseth not its authority for the tryall of spirits by reason of the darkenesse and different apprehensions of spirits. How darke were the Apostles in the Propheties of Christs Resurrection? *Luke 24. 25. Fooles, and slow of heart, to beleieve all that the Prophets have spoken &c.* yet the Scriptures lost not their touchstone authority upon the account of their darkenesse, though Christ saw that truth of the Resurrection in the Scriptures spoken of, which they could not apprehend: *ought not Christ, ver. 26. to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory.* Doth not Peter say plainly, that in the writings of Paul, there are *2 Pet. 3. 16. difficult things, and hard to be understood,* and such as the unstable and unlearned rest; and yet those Writings and Epistles doe not lose their authority, because of the diversities and darkenesse of Believers thoughts: Scripture rightly understood will clearely discover every spirit, and every Doctrine, though the best of men, knowing but in part, *1 Cor. 13. 9.* and so not fully taking in the genuine sense of Scripture, may have, through their darkenesse difference of judgement in things lesse fundamentall. But we may be weary in following such triviall arguments, onely we would not have the saints entrapped in any of Sarrans snares nor the blessed word, that's sweeter then hony, and the hony combe, subjected to the delusions of evill men.

Isay 8. 20.  
vindicated.

Thus we have given thee the strength of his answer; onely he addes his false glosse upon that of *Isay 8. 20.* by us objected against them in the *Perfect Pharisee*: the glosse is this, *Whereas you quote that place, To the Law and to the testimony; it is true, the Law of the new Covenant is written in the heart by God, and the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of Prophecie, and if any be not guided by, and speake according to these, it is because they have no light in them, but without them.* But we answer, As he plainly by this overturnes all Scriptura, and leaves no rule but the Law written upon mens hearts, (which we have confuted in the

the *Perfect Pharisee*, pag. 25.) so it is a grosse perverting of the text and truth : for it is clearely spoken of the *Written Word*, and the very next words expresseth it clearely ; *If they speake not according to this Word*, the Hebrew is full beyond exception, [cedabar hazzeh] *according to this Word* : so that that text is no reference, that God makes to the Law written upon mens hearts, but to the Law written in Tables of stone, which tables, were called *the testimony*, and the Arke thereof called, *the Arke of the testimony*, Exod. 25. 22. because the Tables of stone in which the Law was written, called Exod. 31. 18. *the tables of the testimony* were layd up there.

We have fully shewne in the Booke called the *Perfect Pharisee*, pag. 26. the sad fruits of this Doctrine of denying the *Scripture* to be the rule of trying doctrines and spirits, that it is to open a gap to all the delusions of *Satan*, and we instance in the knowne case of *John Gilpin*, who was sometimes a *Quaker*, to which *Naylor* replies onely thus, *It is no more then if the chiefe priests should have cited Iudas to confute Christ, &c. as he consulted with the priests to betray the truth ; so Iohn Gilpin hath done now, who shall receive his reward, and you priests also*, as *Naylor* sayes. To which rayling we thus answer.

1. That *Iohn Gilpin* was thus acted by the Devill, is a known truth beyond questioning. 2. That he did verily beleve he was acted by Christ, when yet the Devill acted him, is very apparent. Nay *Atkinson*, the boy that pretends to answer that relation of *Gilpin*, doth all along confesse, that he was acted by the Devill, is plaine to any that reades that his childist and non-sensicall piece of rayling. 3. *Iohn Gilpin* himselfe, kce the Lord hath delivered him in mercy out of the snares of *Satan*, hath fully confest, that it was the spirit of *Satan*. and not the Lord Iesus that then acted him. 4. And that all this grew out of his casting off the *Scriptures*, searching to a light within : Take his owne words, pag. 15. of a Booke called, *The Quakers taken*. It was most just with God to give me over to strong delusions to beleve lyes &c. as for other provocations. so especially for rejecting the revealed will of God in his Word. and hearkning onely to a Voice within me ; nay, not onely to listen to the Devils suggestions, but to embrace his Voice for the Voice of Christ.

Thou seest now Reader what reason we had to say, this rejecting the *Scriptures* from being the tryer of Doctrines doth open an unavoydable gap to *Satan*s delusions.

2. But what reason hath the man to say, in this, both *John Gilpin* and we have consulted against Christ? Nay, have we not been pleading for Christ against *Indas*, the desperate betrayer of his truth and Gospel? while we have been discovering the subtilties of *Satan* in those that are asked by him, and pleading for the authority of Christ in his word, against all the delusions of the Devill. And as we can thankfully and comfortably looke upon it, that God hath engaged us in so good a work; so we can looke for our reward, not what *Nayler* we beleave could wish us (but how can he desire, when God hath not desired) but what Christ hath promised to them that can forsake their names and comforts, &c. for his testimony. It is no small slander to say we have consulted with *John Gilpin*, whose face none of us ever saw to our knowledge, till after the Printing of his confession; but there is a day wherein God will call every idle word to an account, and then *Naylers* conceit of his perfection will not take off the guilt of such apparant lyes.

Position 19. That there ought to be no sense, meaning, or exposition given, or studying of the *Scriptures*.

We had many proofes for this, that it was a Position of the *Quakers*, which he denyes not; we could adde more, but 'tis needlesse, because *Nayler* in his answer goes about to justifye the summe of which lyes in these two exceptions.

Excep. 1. <sup>na</sup> The *Scriptures* are either perfect, or not perfect; if perfect, let them alone, and doe not darken them by your invented wisdoms.

Reply 1. To which we answer: The *Scriptures* were given out perfect by the Prophets and Apostles; yet they gave them out in some places more darkely, and in some places more clearly, as *Peter* plainly confesseth, 2 *Per.* 3. 16. that some things *Pauls* Epistles were hard to be understood, and layd downe darkly, as that those that were unlearned, that is, not well acquainted with the mind of the holy Ghost in them, did w<sup>o</sup> them to their owne destruction; which shewes the necessity of opening and expounding *Scriptures*, unless we will suffer m<sup>o</sup> through

Though  
Scripture  
be perfect  
in it selfe,  
yet needs  
expound-  
ing through  
the darknet  
of soules.

thre  
2. V  
bee  
Rea  
of e  
to th  
mar  
ly aff  
24. 2  
Ver.  
spake  
&c. I  
where  
thence  
that h  
4. The  
perfect  
upon t  
darkely  
them e  
through  
Apost  
acise in  
You  
what w  
This  
prayer  
vailed  
are sang  
and so t  
saints, a  
the indw  
rates lig  
riding t  
There  
more t  
in *Pauls*

through their ignorance to runne upon their owne ruine.  
 2. Were the Scriptures imperfect, or did *Ezra* adde to them, because he gave the sense, and caused them to understand the Reading? *Neh. 3. 3.* 3. Doth not Christ speake the necessity of expounding Scripture, though it be perfect, when he said to the Pharisees, *Goe learne what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice?* *Mat. 9. 13.* Nay, doth not Christ clearly assert the necessity of expounding, when he saith *Marke 13. 24. Doe ye not therefore erre, not knowing the Scriptures?* *Ver. 26. Have ye not Read in the Booke of Moyses, how God spake unto him in the Bush saying, I am the God of Abraham, &c. he is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living?* where he openeth the Scripture, and proves the Resurrection from thence, which lay but darkely hid in those words, had not he that had the Key of *David* opened and expounded them.  
 4. The necessity of expounding doth not arise from the imperfection of Scriptures. but from that darkenesse that lyes upon the spirits of the saints. *For now we see through a glasse darkely,* *1 Cor. 13.* so that though the Scriptures be perfect in them selves, yet thou seekest the necessity of the opening of them through the imperfection that is in us. This Christ and the Apostles knew, when they made it a great part of their business in the teaching of soules to expound the Scriptures,

*You that have not that infallible spirit that gave them forth, Except what will you judge, and open, and expound them with? &c.*

This is but an old fraine of his railing, but we can. (let *Reply.* prayse be to free grace) say with the Apostle, *God hath revealed them unto us by the spirit; by the light of which spirit we are taught to compare spirituall things with spirituall,* *1 Cor 2. 13.* and so to open the Scriptures; for though we are the least of saints, and *Naylor* thus revile us: yet we can blesse God for the indwellings of the infallible spirit in us, which communicates light to our soules in that measure that pleaseth him, *according to every man severally as he will.*

The rest of that answer is a heape of bitter rayling which is no more to us, then the chaffe before the wind, or the Viper upon *Pauls* hand, which comes forth from the flaming of their

contention, James 3. 6. and we can shake off as into the fire from whence it came.

**Position 16.** They cry downe Baptisme with Water, and the Lords Supper, as being but types and shadows ceasing upon the appearance of Christ within them.

**Excep. 1.** Though the generall charge lie, and our many proofes which he doth not deny; make it cleare that they cry downe all Baptisme with Water; yet *Nayler* in his answer shuffles from that charge, and falls to except against Infant Baptisme.

**Reply.** Reader we should willingly cleare up that Ordinance of Christ to thee, but it hath bin so fully cleared in the learned writings of Mr. *Marshall*, Mr. *Baxter*, Mr. *Blake*, Mr. *Sidenham*, &c. that we are loath to fill up our Booke with the discussing and clearing up that point (it being already growne up to a bulke beyond our thoughts) and shall referre thee for satisfaction to those large discourses. But let the Reader observe, that this is but a meer evasion of *Nayler*, for our proofes doe evidently satisfie, that they cry downe all manner of Baptisme with Water, not onely the Baptizing of Infants, but of all, and its further apparance by their practice.

**Excep. 2.** But at last he speaks his mind, and reasons against all Baptisme, and quotes that of *Paul*, 1 Cor. 4. 14. *Paul know what he sake when he thanked God he had Baptized no more; for Christ (saith he) sent me not to Baptize, but to Preach.*

**Reply 1.** By these expressions, *Nayler* seems to make *Paul* looke upon his Baptizing others as a sinne, and so to thanke God that he Baptized no more. How is this to heape sinne upon *Peter* and the rest of the Apostles, who Baptized three thousand at one time, *Acts* 2. 41. *Jerusalem and all Iudea went forth to Iohn to be Baptized of him, and yet Iesus himselfe made and Baptized more Disciples then Iohn.* See *Iohn* 4. 1. though Iesus himselfe Baptized none but his Disciples, what is this but to make *Paul* condemne the practice of those saints, and oppose the command of the Lord Iesus, *Goe and Baptize*, Mat. 28. 19.

2. But to give thee the full meaning of *Pauls* expression thou shalt finde, 1 Cor. 1. 12. he is charging them for factions. *One said, I am of Paul, another I am of Apollo, &c.* and argues that



thus, *Were you Baptized in the name of Paul?* and thence takes occasion to *bless God, for not having Baptized many*, lest any should from thence have growne into a Faction; as himselfe gives the reason, *ver. 15.* lest any should say, *I have Baptized in my owne name*, and from thence have made a Faction; so that he blesteth God that sith the *Corinthians* were growne of such Factions and dividing spirits, that providence had so ordered it, that they had by his Baptizing so few of them, so little advantage to cry him, or his name up in opposition to *Apollos, Christ, or Cepha*. Yet by the history of the *Acts of the Apostles*, thou mayst observe, that when ever any were converted by *Paul*, they were Baptized, *Acts 16. 15. ver. 33. Acts 18. 8.* many of the *Corinthians* hearing, *believed, and were Baptized.* Acts 22. 16. &c. But if *Nayler* from that expression, *Christ sent me not to Baptize, but to Preach*, will argue against Baptisme, he will fully make voyd the expresse commands of *Christ* for Baptizing, and charge sinne upon the Apostles practice; so that in stead of crying downe expounding Scriptures we leave him to study what that expression meaneth.

*For the outward signes of the Supper, doe this in remembrance Except of me till I come; but when he was come, then the Bread which they did breake was the Body of Christ.*

We cannot but be amazed at his grosse perverting Scripture: *Reply 1.* but we have showne the false meaning of that expression (*till he come*) in the *Perfect Pharisee*, pag. 29. That those *Corinthians* to whom *Paul* wrote, and commands to use that Ordinance, *Doe this in remembrance of me, till the coming of Christ, &c.* were those in whom he was *spiritually come before*, 1 Cor. 1. 2. Yet notwithstanding that *spiritual coming*, they were commanded to *eate of the Bread, and drinke of the Cup, to shew forth the Lords death* 1 Cor. 11. 26. *till he come*; that is not till his *spirituall coming* in the worke of grace (that was past before) but *his coming in glory*.

2. The life of saints here is a life of Faith, *Heb. 10. 38. the just shall live by his Faith*. Now for the nourishing and strengthening of Faith, he hath left the Seales of *Bread and Wine*, as the holders forth of *his Body and Blood* for Faith to act it selfe upon; and therefore before Faith be swallowed up in vision, these

The Lords Supper an Ordinance to the end of the world.

are appointed as standing Ordinances by the Lord Iesus for the establishing of it.

The rest of his answer is made up of such rayling in stead of reasoning, and such inconsistent expressions, that we shall onely leave him to the Lord, to deale with his conscience for the guilt of them.

Position 17. *Thus there is no mediate Call to the Ministry.*

He denyes not our prooffe, and in stead of answering the many Scripture arguments we gave in our *Perfect Pharisee*, pag. 32 for a mediate call to the Ministry, he falls to a downe-right rayling; though we have nothing we need to add to the arguments we there layd down against this Position, meeting with no answer to what we have written; yet we shall observe in the midst of his raylings these things.

1. *How flatly he contradicts himselfe*, when he tells the Reader, pag. 19. l. 8. *the Apostles when they had gathered Churches out of the world, they ordained them Elders of themselves?* yet after sayes, l. 10. 11. *these were ordained not by man; and after, l. 13. 14. this ordination was not by man, nor by the Churches, &c.* the Apostles ordained them Elders; and yet those Elders were not ordained by man: were not the Apostles men? And was not this a mediate call, wherein the Apostles ordained them Elders in every City, *Acts* 14. 23.

2. Though he labours with abundance of bitterneffe to cry downe any mediate call; yet as he answers nothing to our Scriptures; so we cannot but observe, how he is forced in the midst of his rayling to *confesse the truth*, laying, pag. 19. l. 8. *the Apostles ordained them Elders*, which is that mediate call we contended for.

Lastly, The substance of his rayling is to tell us, that we are invested in the Ministry by *Magistrates Townes, and Parishes*; when as, we doe professe we doe not know a Minister in *England* that is ordained, or professeeth to receive his ordination from a Magistrate, Towne, or Parish.

2. All that the Magistrate, Towne, or Parish doe, is to provide maintenance for those that labour in the Gospel; nay, the late Commission (which perhaps *Nayler* drives at) never pre-

pretended to put any in the Office of a Minister, but onely provided maintenance for him in the propagation of the Gospel; so that notwithstanding what he hath said, we are still fully convinced of the cleareness of a mediate call to the worke of publique Ministry of the Word.

And thus we have followed him in every materiall expression, though he answers nothing to our Scriptures, or Arguments: And though his great cavill be at our testimonies, and upon this cryes out as if we published filthy lyes; yet the Reader will now clearly see, that of 55. proofes we layd downe, he onely denies the truth of seven, which are yet fully cleared, and proved either by the testimony of these that were the witnesses, under their Hands and Seales; or by the demonstration out of their owne Books, however *Naylor* labours to evade and shuffle them. How unjustly we have been charged with lyes, will now appeare; and we must seriously professe, that had it not been to cleare up those truths, which he chargeth with falsehood, and vindicating Scripture from his grosse perverting of them, his Booke is so meerey composed of rayling, and abusing us, and so beyond expectation sottish and senselesse, that we should not have thought it at all worth our answer or observation.

Were we not ready according to that rule, 1 *Pet.* 3. 15. *to give a reason of the hope that is in us*; and that *Tit.* 1. 9. 10. 11. *to convince gainsayers, (whose mouths must be stopped)* we should not have troubled thee, or our selves, with answering such triuall exceptions as doe hereafter follow, against what we have proved so plainly from Scripture, against the Principles of the *Quakers*; But that we may not seem to leave any stone unturned that may cleare up the truth to the spirits of the people of God; we shall proceed to the consideration of that which follows in *Nayers* answer.

Principle 1. *Not to salute any.*

**R** Eader, though we have proved that this command *Luke* 10. 4. of not *saluting any by the way*, were but a particular case, and not generally binding (as we have made evident by many Scripture Arguments, and the practises of the Saints) and though we have fully proved the command of Christ imposeth generall

generall salutation upon saints, as a duty, as thou mayst Reade *Perfect Pharisee*, pag. 31. 42. yet thus he excepts.

*Excep.<sup>t</sup>* The summe of his exception is against *High-way salutes*.

To which we answer.

*Reply.* 1. *High-way Salutes* are the knowne practice of *Quakers*, 29 when they meet any of their owne way in the Streets, or other-where, their Phrase is, *How dost thou*, and their action, to take them by the Hand. And if that Text command against High-way salutes, how contrary is their practice to it, *Salute no man by the way*.

2. However the *Quakers* doe contend against high-way salutes, (though by their owne practice, *Publican*-like amongst one another, they contradict this Principle) yet high-way salutes were the practice of saints, when holy *Jacob* met his Brother *Esau* by the high-way, *Gen.* 33. 3. *He passed over before them, and bowed himselfe before him seven times, untill he came neere to his Brother, &c.* Did not gracious *Abigail* salute *David* by the high-way? *1 Sam.* 25. 27. *When David was comming to her house, she went to meet him, and when Abigail saw David, she hasted, and lighted off the Asse, and fell before David on her face, and bowed her selfe by the ground.* Thus you see the practice of the saints in high-way salutes.

3. Nay, it was not onely the custome of the saints to salute by bodily gestures, but by words also, and words equivalent to what are used by the people of God in *England* in their salutations. See *1 John* 10. where *John* forbiddeth them to give the least countenance to the hereticall venters of false Doctrines, commands them not so much as to bid them *God-speed*; which clearely proves, that that high-way salutation, was a common thing in the Apostles dayes, and not to be denyed to any, but such wicked persons as the Apostle there speaks of in carrying on their wicked Principles; *If any man bring not this Doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed.* Hence *Naylers* colour, of taking the name of God in vaine, we fully declare against peoples using that Phrase without any sense of God upon their soules. Yet looke upon salutes as a command of Christ, and so wish all such as doe use the name of the blessed God in their salutes, either to keep a due regard of that

Majesty

Exposition  
of  
1 John  
10.  
Salutes of  
Primitive  
times.

Majesty upon their spirits when they use his glorious name, or else to use some other expression.

His next cavill is against that plaine Text, *Mat. 5. 47. If Except. 2*  
*ye salute your Brethren onely, what doe you more then doe others?*  
*doe not even the Publicans so?* Where in stead of submitting to  
 the authority of the commands of Christ; He sayes thus. *It is*  
*no command to them to salute all, but a warning to them of their*  
*partiality.*

1. He that hath but looked upon that Text *Mat. 5. 46. 47. Reply.*  
 but with halfe an eye, will clearely see, that he must as well ex-  
 cept, that *Christ doth not command to love all*, as to say, *that Christ*  
*doth not command to salute all*; when its apparant, that the very  
 phrase and reason in both commands, is the very same.

2. Sure this man doth not understand himselfe, when he  
 affirms, that this is a command *against partiality*, in saluting;  
 and yet is not a command to salute all: for what is partiality  
 in saluting? but this saluting some, and not saluting all. What  
 a ridiculous cavill is this, even to the contradicting of himselfe?

3. As to his endeavouring by this ridiculous, and selfe con-  
 tradicting exposition, to charge us with partiality, as that we  
 salute onely those whom we love, and who are rich, &c. we say  
 it is a malicious slander; for tis sufficiently knowne, we salute  
 Strangers, whose face we never saw before, and the poore of the  
 people, as well as the richest of them; nay, the very *Quakers* them-  
 selves also: But how doth this againe fly in their Faces, who  
 for the most part carry with so much incivility to all, but to  
 people of their owne way.

3. There is a third exception, which we must not passe over *Except. 3*  
 without serious observation, it being a more then ordinary dis-  
 covery of the spirit of the *Quakers*. Where when we charge  
 them for *picking and choosing* at the command of Christ, such  
 things in Scripture as doe most agree with their humors and  
 fancies, thus, *though they are forbid in the same place, Luke*  
*7. 4. to carrie money in their purses, or to wear shoes on their*  
*feet, as well as to salute any by the way*; yet we charge them in  
 this, *because they stand upon the one command, and not upon any*  
*of the rest*, and doe evidently bring themselves within the curle,  
*Rev. 22. Naylor thus replies to it, pag. 21. l. 4. &c What we*

☞ doe is not from the command that was to others, but from command of the same power by which we are sent forth; and if we were commanded to forbear wearing shoes, as well as we are commanded to forbear your Heathenish customs, &c. we should be made willing to obey, as some have done who have been commanded to goe naked, &c.

Reply. Now thou mayst see the mystery of iniquity, that lyes in the Quakers, layd open; we can bleſſe the Lord that hath made them thus unvaile themselves, and discover the rottenneſſe of their hearts as to the authority of the Scriptures, which they have so long by their juggling endeavoured to conceal. For here thou wilt clearly see, that the Quakers look upon the commands of Christ in Scripture, as having no soveraigne or binding authority over their consciences and practises, further then agree with their owne Principles and fancies. For what means that expression? *What we doe, is not from the command that was to others.* This without controverſie is utterly to shake off the authority of the the Word. For 1. Was not the whole Word written to others? Did any now alive live in those dayes when the Prophets or Apostles writ their severall Bookes? Were we of the Church of *Corinth*? or *Philippi*? Were we of the seven Churches of *Asia*? or did we live in these dayes? Alas, there is no command in Scripture but was given to others long before the dayes of our Fathers; and shall no command given to others be binding to us? Let them Reade these convincing Texts, *Rom. 15. 4. Whatsoever things were Written before time, were Written for our learning*; where *Paul* makes the Bookes of the Old Testament binding to those who were not alive when they were Written; for the *Romans* to whom he then Wrote, were borne many hundred yeares after the writing of those Scriptures. *1 Cor. 10. 11. All these things happened unto them for examples, and they were Written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.* *2 Tim. 3. 16. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, reproofe, correction, instruction in righteousness.* So the *2 Peter. 1. 19.* speaking of the Scriptures, that sure Word of Propheſie, sayes, *they doe well to take heed to them, as to a light*



*in a dark place*; though they were Prophecies and commands given forth to other persons many hundred yeares before. Thus you see that commands in Scripture that were given forth to others, are yet of universall concernment unto all, to those that lived not in those dayes, even such upon whom the ends of the world are come.

For that other expression of *Naylers*, *If we were commanded to forbear to weare shoes, &c.* what a wretched casting off is this of the yoke of Christ, and a desperate picking and choosing in his commands, onely what is agreeing to their owne fancies. Is not this, *to breake his bands asunder and cast his cords from them*, Psal. 2. 3. *If we were commanded*; Is not the revealed will of Christ a command? Is one part of the same verse a command, (see *Luke 10. 4.*) and not the other part? Is nothing a command till they judge it so? How loose doe they hang in obedience to the Lord Jesus? they will obey, and not obey, as they shall see cause: Praises be to our God that we have discovered them; Now we understand the reason why *Naylor* answered none of our Scriptures; we perceive he looked upon them as nothing to him: and now we clearly see the meaning of their shuffling about the Word of God, and their scornfull expressions about the written Word, &c. So that we can boldly charge them from this place with this horrid blasphemy, that the *Quakers* doe as-  
fume.

*That the Scriptures have no authority over their consciences at all, nor any command in Scripture that was given to others that binds them, save what command they have an impulse upon their owne spirits; for,*

This is the great strong hold of Satan, and the snare, with which he entraps them as he will.

From this Principle of theirs, he goes about to prove the law-fulness of people going naked, and reviles us for speaking against it; and sayes they doe it by particular command from God. Reader, thou mayst observe, That *Naylor* denyes not what we wrote about their going naked in *Perfect Pharisee*, pag. 48. the Wife of *Edmond Adlington* of *Kendale* going naked through the streets, Nov. 21. 1653. We shall adde more, because some that have lesse acquaintance with these people, may seeme to

Mark that

make question of it. On Munday *October* 28. 1653. there was one *Thomas Holme* of *Kendale* went as naked as he was borne through the Market place at *Kirby Stephen* on the market day; at his turning he said, *It is not I, but God that goeth naked, &c.* and so after a time, he went to his clothes, which were kept in a Barne by foure men of his Sect. And to shew that this is a fact they iustifie and pleade for (in stead of mourning for the horrible sin of it) *Mr. Tylour* a great ring-leader of that people, came to that Towne the weeke after to seeke *Mr. Higginson*, Minister of that place, as he said, having a Message to him from the Lord, and being there in the Market place, he very solemnely pronounced a woe against it, for rejecting that Prophet of the Lord, which he had sent to doe signes and wonders in it, meaning, as those that heard him did conceive, that beast that went starke naked through the Towne a little before.

This we have from *Mr. Higginson*, under his owne hand.

*Thomas Casly*, January 10. 1653. went shamelesly naked as he was borne through the streets at *Kendale*. *Edmand Nubys* Wife went through *Kendale* naked, except that she had a shift on: and about the latter end of December last, she came into the place of meeting of the Church at *Kendale* in the same posture. Another of this Sect came in the same posture into *Hutton Chapel* at the time of exercise about the beginning of January. *Elizabeth Levens*, and *Miles Newby* went up the streets at *Kendale* in the same posture. This we have attested from *Mr. Walker* a godly Minister at *Kendale* under his hand, by Letters bearing date January 31. 1653. But were it needfull to prove it, we could by sending into places where these converse, fill thee with undeniable evidence hereof; but its needlesse, because *Nayler* denyeth it not, but labours to iustifie them in this sinfull practice. As to the manifesting of the wickednesse hereof, we shall give thee these considerations.

1. No sooner had *Adam* and *Eve* fallen, and were stripped of their Innocency, but they saw themselves shamefully naked, *Gen* 3. 10. But God who knowes the working of corruption in the hearts of men after the fall, he himselfe clothed them, lest their nakednesse should appeare, *ver*. 31. Unto *Adam* also, and to his Wife, did the Lord God make Coats of Skins, and clothed

cloathed them. And doth not this manifest the will of God again? going naked? would he have cloathed them, if he would have had them continue in that nakednesse?

2. But that you may yet see further, how odious being naked before others is in the sight of God, the sad curse that *Noah* from the mouth of God layd upon *Ham* the Father of *Canaan*, for not covering his Fathers nakednesse, will appeare *Gen. 9. 22. 23. 24.* &c. *Ham the Father of Canaan saw the Nakednesse of his Father, and told his two Brethren without, and Shem and Japheth took a garment and layd it upon both their shoulders, and went backward, and covered the nakednesse of their Fathers, and their Faces were backward, and they saw not their Fathers nakednesse; And Noah awoke from his Wine, and knew what his younger Sonne had done to him, and said, Cursed be Canaan, &c. and he said, Blessed be the God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant, &c. God shall enlarge Japheth, and Canaan shall be his servant, &c.* Where you see, *Ham* is bitterly cursed, and the curse entailed to all his Posterity for that sinne of not covering his Fathers nakednesse. And what then shall we thinke of such an expression as *Mary Collison* a Quaker in *Kendale* used to these that covered the nakednesse of the Wife of *Edmund Adlington*, in the street at *Kendale*, That they had hindered the worke of the Lord? Oh! let them remember the curse of *Ham*, and the blessing of *Shem* and *Japheth* here expressed.

3. The Apostle arguing to the care that one Saint ought to have over another, doth it by a comparison of them with the body naturall; and tells you *1 Cor. 12. 23. 24.* those members of the body which we judge to be lesse honourable, upon those we bestow more abundant honour, and our uncomely parts (*αἰσχρὰ*, See *Rom. 1. 27.* *pudenda, indecora membra, instrumenta excretionis, & generationi destinata*) have more abundant comeliness; for our comely parts (*viz.* Face, Hand, &c.) have no need; marke that, the uncomely parts needed, yea they are such parts, that (as the Apostle phraseth it) they lacked more abundant honour, *viz.* lest their nakednesse and shame should appeare.

4. In the *1. Sam. 10. 4.* When *Hamen* the King of *Amor* had cut off the garments of *Dauids* servants in the middle, even to their buttocks, &c. and sent them away, the men were greatly  
ashamed,

*ashamed*, ver. 5. and *David*, in the sense of this wicked act, made warre against the men of *Ammon*, and destroyed them; so sensible was *David* of the wickednesse of this act, of discovering the nakednesse of his servants.

5. 1 *Tim.* 2. 9. The Apostle wills, that *Women* adorne themselves in modest Apparell, with *bauesfastnesse* and *sobriety*. And we leave it to the Reader to consider, whether either going naked; or having nothing but their shift on, be any wayes according to the modesty, bashfulnesse, and sobriety, by the Apostle commanded in that place.

6. To adde no more, we shall conclude with laying before thee the wickednesse of this practice, besides that impudencie, and immodesty, even such as nature and ingenuity it selfe obhorres, this practice speaks: Oh! what a fuel is this to the flames of lust, what accursed fires of Hell doth it kindle in the hearts of men? Doth not the Apostle strictly charge all, to mortifie their earthly members, *Col.* 3. 5. *Fornication, uncleannesse, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, &c.* nay, doth he not say, ver. 6. *For these things sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience.* And 1 *Thes.* 4. 4. he chargeth every one that he should know how to possess his Vessel in sanctification and honour, not in the lust of concupiscence, &c. And what is the horriblenesse of the temptation of such wicked practices? this is so loathsome, and nauseous to any sober apprehensions, that surely it will make the very practisers of such things, to be a stinke in their nostrils, and be looked upon as a shame, both to Religion and Humanity, and we are fully certified from severall parts it doth so alreadie.

There is but one thing that we imagine can be pretended for this wicked practice; and that is the Prophets going naked upon particular command; we shall take that which is the fullest Scripture for it, *Isay* 20. 3. and in that, answer all together. Where God sayes to *Isaiah*, *Goe and loose thy sackcloth from off thy loynes, and put off thy shoes from thy feet, and he did so, walking barefoot and naked.*

1. We are fully satisfied, and we hope we have satisfied the Reader in the *Perfect Pharisee*, pag. 45. 46. 47. 48. that the pretences of these men to immediate calls, are but mere delusi-

ons, and an apish imitation of the Prophets: But what these Prophets did, was by a true immediate call from God, which we owne, though we abhorre the pretence of these men to it, of the lying and falsehood whereof we have informed thee fully.

2. Did either Jesus Christ, or the Apostles, when they came to publish the everlasting Gospel, ever take up such imitation?

3. For the full meaning of that place, understand 1. Some will onely understand this thing as done in vision, *Hos. 1. 2. Take unto thee a Wife of Whoredomes.* 2. Others conceive it was really acted and with them we rather close. But what was that nakednesse? it was not the putting off all their garments, that their shame should appeare; but the putting off their upper garments. For so the word *naked* is often used in Scripture, when a man goeth in his inner rayment onely, without upper garments; so it is said of *Saul*, he in a Prophetick rapture strip'd off his cloathes, that is, his upper cloathes, (for the Jewes used to weare an upper garment upon their long Cas-sake, which was close next their bodies) and lay downe *naked* before *Samuel*, 1 *Sam.* 19. 24. So in *Isay*, 31. 11 the women are commanded to strip themselves, and make them bare, (that is, to put off their bravery and better apparell, &c.) 2. This *nakednesse* is the putting off his Prophetickall Robe, for the Prophets had an upper garment of hayre, to distinguish them from others, as you may plainly see *Zach.* 13. 4. *neither should they weare a rough garment to deceive.* See 2 *Kings* 1. 8. *Mat.* 3. 4. this was such a mantle as dropped from *Eliab*, 2 *Kings* 2. 13. and thus a Prophet wanting his Prophetickall mantle or garment, is said to be *naked*, and Scripture calls him *naked*. 3. What was *Isaiah* to signifie by this? you must know, his foretelling the shamefull captivity of *Ethiopia*, ver. 3. was the intent of this command, how the *Egyptian* Prisoners were to be handled; therefore he was to goe strip'd in that posture as Captives and Prisoners use to be; Now the common usage of Prisoners, is not to leave them quite naked, but to take away their best apparell, and to leave them under ragged cloathes, or such as was necessary to cover their shame; for can it be imagined that they should be led stark naked from *Egypt* to *Affria*, so many hundred of miles. 4. But to put all out of doubt that it was not meant of being

being *Starke naked*, can any man be so deavoyd of sense, as to imagine the good man went *Starke naked three yeares together*? Reade *Isay* 20. 4. that time which the Prophet went *naked*, was for three whole yeares.

Therefore let these people see how vainely they doe bring in the practice of the Prophets, though farre different from theirs; and though *acted* upon that call from God (which the *Quakers* but pretend to, doth speake the lying spirit they are *acted* by) how vainely we say these things are wrested by them to bolster them up in such wayes, as will make even a Heathen blush that hath but any remaining sparkes of ingenuity.

Principle 2. *Not giving any outward token of Reverence to Magistrates, Parents, Master, or any other.*

Quakers to  
justifie  
their vway,  
cast dirt  
upon the  
Saints in  
Scripture.

We have said so much to this, that we need say no more, only we must observe, that rather then he will be convinced by Scripture light, this man cares not to charge the chiefest of Saints with sin in this case, but that it was no sin in them, that Scripture will fully speake, *Rom. 13. 7. Render to all their due, tribute to whom tribute is due, honour to whom honour.* So that as there are some to whom tribute is distinguishingly due; there are also some to whom honour is due also, as we have proved at large, *Perfekt Pharisee* pag. 33. 34. to which the Reader may observe he answereth nothing.

But he goes on with his ridiculous application of Scripture; viz. that of the Commandement, *Thou shalt not bow down or worship*, which is evidently spoken of adoring graven Images made with hands, and this is *Naylers* text, against giving outward tokens of honour to Magistrates or Parents, as though they were Idols: as ridiculously doth he also cite that Text, *Pro. 25. 26. A righteous man falling downe before the wicked; is as a troubled Fountaine*; which speaks onely the falling, perishing, crushing of the Saints by ungodly men, which is like filth or mud third up in a Fountaine,

There onely remains the learned Annotation of *A. P.* Sure *A. P.* had some great crotchet in his head, that he must needs stop it in the Margent, with his name at the bottome; sure tis some demonstration. But what is it? There is a Power with-

A. P. his  
Annotation  
ons answer-  
ed,

OUT



out Persons, because the *Keepers of the Liberties of England* were no Persons. We aske him, *Were the Keepers of the Liberties of England, no body?* And was this honourable *no body* set up by the authority of Parliament, against whom it should be Treason to act? But what is this to make Government without Governors; Power without Persons to manage it? Were not the Parliament *Governors*? or were the Parliament men who were the supreme *Governors*, *Were not they Persons?* what were they? But what becomes of the Justices of Peace, will they be content to be turned out of their being by *A. P.* But seriously *A. P.* if there be Government without Governors, who shall punish sin? who shall make Laws? who shall preserve the Peace? shall Government? when it is in no bodys hands? But let him leave his wild notion, and look upon *1 Pet. 2. 13. Submit your selves, to, &c. whether the King as Supreme, or unto Governors, as unto them that are sent by him.* And *Rom. 13. 4. 6. he is the Minister of God to thee, they are the Ministers of God attending on this very thing, and there he will learn that him and them, and he and they, doe signifie not things, but Persons in the power, not Government but Governors;* so that we leave him amongst the rest of his fancies to Rudy Sir *Thomas Moores* Eutopia, or *Plannes* Common-wealth, where probably he may find a Government without any Persons to Govern, or be Governed.

Principle 3. *That no man must have the title of Master.*

All he replyes to this, is, that *we bring the practice of men in the Old Testament to disanull the commands of Christ in the New.* We give the man leave to lye and rayle, as having nothing else to say. For if thou look into the *Perfett Pharisee*, p. 34. 35. thou wilt see at least ten Scriptures out of the New Testament fully discovering the vanity of this Principle, and the lawfulnessse of calling men *Sir* or *Master*, besides the opening of what Christ meant in that prohibition, *Mat. 23. 10.* so that we need to add no more.

There are foure things that they charge against the Ministry, to wit, 1. *That they love the high places in the Synagogues.* 2. *That they weare long Robes.* 3. *That they stand praying in the Synagogues.* 4. *That they Preach for hire.*

*M*

*We*

We dare without boasting say, we have by evident demonstration from the Scripture shewn at large, that these were the proper guilt of the Pharisees, and no way applicable to the godly Ministers of England. See *Perf. Pharisee*, p. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. And we are saved the labour of further clearing those points, for as much as *Nayler* returns nothing of answer to what we there layd downe. We onely beg the Reader in these points to compare our Book and his together, and we leave it to thee to judge. But as we have all along found nothing but rayling in stead of reason, and the poyson of Aspes under his tongue, in stead of the force of reason or Scripture; so he doth here heap up such a masse of bitter revilings, as thou hast not seen: but we leave this evill spirit in him to the Lord to rebuke.

In pag. 40. of the *Perf. Pharisee*, thou wilt find us repeating others of their cavills against the Ministry, *viz.* Their *having been at Universities.* 2. *Making use of an houre-glasse.* 3. *Preaching upon a text.* 4. *Running to the powers of the World to protest w.* 5. *Stealing from the Prophets.* 6. *Not thoning.* Four of these he answers nothing to; for the fifth he repeats that Scripture that is *against stealing the word of the Lord from their neighbours*; as if to name the same charge again, were enough to prove it, though we have cleared it in the *Perf. Pharisee*, That in quoting Scripture we doe but follow the example of Christ and the Apostles. See *Perf. Pharisee*, pag. 37. 38. and walke by Scripture rule. And for the sixth, *viz. thoning*, we told him, that the not thoning all, doth no wayes entrench upon any Attribute or command of God; and being but an expression of a civill respect, as *Sir, Master, most noble, most excellent* (which the Saints in the New Testament used) we told him, we saw no cause why the same freedome in our dialect might not be used. Had he excepted any thing against these, we should have answered him. And for *that pure language*, which he sayes the Saints are redeemed unto, we cannot but wonder at the lownesse of the mans conceptions in the things of God, to think the pure language to which God restores them, is to make them say, *then* and *thee*. Oh! the blindness of these men in the things of Christ; for that pure language, *Zeph. 3. 9.* imports, the peoples deliverance from Idolatrous worship, *shall no more call upon their*

The Quakers make the pure language to which the Saints are redeemed, to be, vvhhen they begin to Thon all men.

their Idols, nor call God by the name of their Idols, Hof. 2. 16. nor use the language of *Astodod*. Neh. 13. 24. but call upon the name of the Lord, and serve him with one consent. Having gone through these things in our Perfect Pharisee, we proceeded, pag. 41. to some considerations of their practices.

### Practice 1. Quaking.

For trembling and quaking we own it; but for grovelling on Excep.<sup>t</sup> the ground, and foaming at the mouth, are lyes and slanders of your own inventing.

Are they lyes and slanders? Was not John Gilpin a Quaker? Reply. and when a Quaker he tells you thus, in the Book called *Quakers Shaken*, p. 5. *I could not stand upon my feet, but was constrained to fall down upon the bed, where I howled and cried, as is usuall with them, in a terrible and hideous manner, to the great astonishment of my Family.* Pap 7. further, *In the time of John Andrews speaking, I was from the power within me drawne from the chaire upon which I sat, and throwne upon the ground in the midst of the company, where I lay all night; all which time I was turned from my backe to my belly, and so backe again.* &c. Is not this grovelling upon the ground? How dare this man say they are lyes? Nay Atkinson, who would seem to answer that Booke, in his pittifull Pamphlet, pag. 11. sayes, *he owned it to be of God.* So in *Quakers Shaken*, pag. 10. he sayes, *I was cast upon the ground, and lying upon my belly, I was forced to lick the dust.* Atkinson denies it not, but tells him, *this is his portion.* And how can Naylor say, that these things are lyes and slanders? We shall add but one more, as to their foaming at mouth, we shall give you this account under the hand of Mr. Moore Minister at Kellet in Lancashire.

One of the Quakers comming to disturbe our Congregation, fell into a trance, her belly puffed up, her sides extended, her back-bone thrust out, her shoulders stretched up, her whole body as a bladder when it is in blowing: Whereupon I sent a mayde to George Fox, to tell him, he had indeed alleaged many Scriptures for quaking and trembling, but wisthall to aske him, what Scriptures he could shew one for swelling of the body, or foaming at the mouth; or where did he ever reade of any in those postures. save onely such

as were possessed with Devils: He denied that any of theirs swelled, till she was pointed out, and then he confessed it; upon which she asked him, whether lying was a sin? because he had before denied that he committed any sin. Will, Moore.

Read and judge what thou now thinkest of these mens sayings and lyings.

As for our large discovery of the nature of quaking, owning it where there was any real appearance of God to the Prophets, and shewing a clear difference betwixt these divine raptures, and the Satanicall quakings of these men, he answers nothing at all, but onely evils at a word.

*Excep. 3* That we say, *They call their Quaking their great perfection*; which he sayes *is false, &c.*

*Reply.* To which we answer. We cannot but look upon that as the great perfection in the eyes of these men, which they doe so much

*W. C.* cry up, and so much desire as such a pretious attainement. One of us doth know, that *Cap. Ward*, and *Will. Carmel*, did expresse their desires of it, and their hopes to come under that condition. *Henry Hausman* said, speaking concerning quaking, *he was not come up to that perfection yet.* We might adde more; but *Iohn Gilpin* tells you in *Quakers Shaken*, p. 5. that he did earnestly desire that he might fall into quaking and trembling, apprehending that he should thereby attain to the immediate discoveries of God unto him. And is not that perfection? Why doth *Naylor* still charge us with slanders?

*Practice. 2. Rayling.*

*Excep. 1.* He would endeavour from Scripture to lay downe a warrant for his rayling; and his reason is, because *Christ called the Jewes the children of the Devil &c. The Apostle calls men dogs, wolves, &c.*

*Reply. 1.* We charged them with rayling at those persons they had never seen before; telling them, they were Devils, damned, they saw the Devil in their faces, so that this appeared to be perfect rayling; because not knowing the persons or actions of any such men, nor any particular sinne by them, yet they let fly their dreadfull censures at randome. Thus we instanced in our *Perfect Pharisces* p. 46. in their rayling at *Mr. H. T. Merchant* of *Newcastle*, calling him a Priest, &c. and *Gorge Fox* rayling at *Mr. Nichols* in *Carlisle*, p. 48. telling him he was an hypocrite, though he had never

never seen his face, nor knew his name. Now how is this bot-  
tom'd upon Christs example, or the Apostles, who gave such ex-  
pressions to none but such as they had particular knowledge of,  
as to their sinne; giving a reason for such titles.

2. Those titles were given to wicked *Herod*, and to the teach-  
ers of false Doctrines, *Phil. 3. 2 Pet. 2.* and we have fully cleared  
it we hope to every mans conscience, who is not filled with er-  
rour and prejudice, that we are neither reproachers of Christ, or  
his Doctrine; but according to our talent, have found mercy of  
the Lord to be faithfull in carrying on the interest of the Lord  
Jesus; and therefore we cannot but looke upon it as their sin-  
full practice, in powring out such language upon us.

3. He that doth but reade the Scriptures, shall finde, that this  
is not the ordinary language of Christ and his Apostles, it was  
very seldome, and very solemne; and he that doth but compare  
this, with the practice of *quakers*, shall see a vast difference: for  
it is their common practice, and such words are as familiar as  
any they use, as *thou art damned, and I see the Devill in thy face*;  
nay, they are their usuall first salute to all they meet withall.  
Was this the Apostles way? take but any of their Books, and  
compare them with any of *Pauls* Epistles, and as thou wilt see  
a spirit of sweetnesse and meeknesse in his, so thou wilt observe  
such a continuall froathing out of passion and bitterness in these  
men, as will lay them naked, to be acted by a spirit vastly differ-  
ent from that of *Paul* or any of the Apostles of the Lord Jesus.

4. But shall the holy zeale of Christ and his Apostles be wrest-  
ed to be made a patronage to their malicious *raylings*? Doe they  
not by this means, labour to take away the sinfulness of that  
rayling, which the Apostle tells you is the *fruit of the flesh*, and  
of which they that are guilty, *shall never enter into the Kingdom*  
*of God*, 1 Cor. 6. 9. But we referre thee for further information  
in this to the *Perfect Pharisee*, pag 44. 45.

Pract. 3. *Their pretending upon all occasions to be sent by  
speciall Commission from God.*

1. Here we having related by severall passages of the *quakers*  
pretending to a Commission from God, the ridiculousnesse of  
their Messages, and that pretence, he plainly tells us, *he will not  
justifie them*; and when he cannot shuffle it off, he tell us, *he can*

say nothing to it, because he knows not the things in particular; though the persons (Reader, thou mayst observe) that are there mentioned are of his familiar company and converse; and so thou wilt easily think, had they been lyes, we should have heard from him with open mouth: yet the man will needs take the boldnesse to call them lyes, though he confesse he knows not the particulars. Now Reader, judge of *Nayler* and his conscience.

3. He sayes, that they who were before the *Magistrates*, were invited to any of our houses, is false. Oh! the confidence of this man, and how boldly dare he rush upon a lye, or any thing, to make us odious. All we say is, that some of them that came to *Newcastle* were invited to come to our houses by some of us. If *James Nayler* will aske *M. Tayler*, if he were not invited by *W. C.* to his house, when he was at that time at *Newcastle*, and did not come, he will see the debauchednesse of his conscience; for *W. C.* doth beleve, *M. Tayler* hath so much honesty left, as not to deny it.

As to *George Fox* cursing *M. Fetherston*, which we quoted, p. 48. *Perf. Phar.* all that *Nayler* replies is, that *M. Fetherston* confessed, all that *Geo. Fox* spoke, was *Scripture*. What a ridiculous evasion is this of so great a sin? Because there are such words in *Scripture*, therefore he may apply them as he will. There are these words in *Scripture*, *I am the Lord, and change not; he sits upon the circle of the Heavens, &c. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was God*; these expressions, because they are in *Scripture*, is it therefore lawfull to give them to any creature? Nay, dare *Geo. Fox* challenge them to himself, because they are in *Scripture*? Or because such words, *the Lord smite thee thou painted wall: thou hast lied against the holy Ghost; for whom is reserved the blacknesse of darknesse for ever*; Are these true of *G. Fox*? or may we therefore lawfully apply them to *G. Fox*? because they are such words as are found in *Scripture*? Oh! what a ridiculous evasion is this? He may also plead, that he and his followers may lawfully swear, because the words [swear and oaths] are to be found in *Scripture*; and then this generation will perfectly come up to the necessary and experienced fruit of these principles, viz. Ranting to a great degree whereof they are already attained in their most impudent, obscene, and shamelesse nakednesse.

The

Quakers justify their cursing because such words are in *Scripture* and make the *Scripture* a warrant for cursing.



The next exception is against our objecting *Perf. Phar.* p. 48. *Christopher Atkinson* his immodest familiarity with a woman of that way &c. where *Atkinson* challengeth the proofe of it: we shall onely say, that that immodest familiarity (if he will needs force us, from our modest covering of that carriage, to speak out) it was his familiar Kissing of her, as we are fully informed by the testimony of *M. Walker* and *M. Wallas*, and we cannot but account it as a sinfull behaviour. But to weaken the strength of this testimony, *Atkinson* tells the Reader, that *M. Wallas* said, *It was no murder in him to murder Christopher Atkinson, and the rest of the prisoners at Kendale.*

Truely we are afraid this whole generation of men are in a confederacy of lying; we have purposely sent to finde out the truth of this soule challenge, and shall give thee his clearing of himselfe word for word as we received it.

**H**aving received a Paper from the Quakers that were prisoners containing horrible blasphemies, viz. That they were the searchers of hearts, and saying, Let them be accursed from God for ever, that will have Christ have any other Body, but his Church. I spoke these words, and no more, in the hearing of many, viz. (That I thought it was no murder in the civill Magistrate to put such blasphemers as they were to death, it being according to the Law of God.) But that I ever said, It was no murder in me to murder them, or to put them to death, I declare it to be a manifest lye.

*M. Wallace*  
his vindica-  
tion from  
*Atkinson*  
lye.

Reads *Zee*  
24. 10. 16.  
*Deut.* 13. the  
whole  
chapter.

*Kendale Jan. 14. 1653.*

*John Wallace.*

We whose names are subscribed, did heare when *M. Wallace* spoke these words above writtem, namely, *these which are inclosed within the parenthesis, but no more.*

*Thomas Berket. Miles Harrison.*

Now let the Reader judge of what spirit these men are; and as for the rayling which *Atkinson* powres out by reason of this testimony like a flood upon *W. C.* we his Brethren say, we hope he hath learned that of Christ, *1 Pet. 2. 23. who when he was reviled, reviled not againe, when he suffered, he threatened not, but committed himselfe to him that judgeth righteously.*

There

There is but one thing remains, And that is the account we gave, why we called our Booke the *Perfect Pharisee*, which thou mayst reade in pages 49. 50. 51. and so conclude. We therein prove from Scripture, that that Title was most truly and properly applicable to them: to which *Nayler* answers so exceeding weakely and raylingly, that we are resolved not to reply one word thereto, as having said enough before to that purpose, to discover how weakely he struggles to evade the clearenesse of these Scriptures against himselfe and that way.

Reader, thou wilt by this time, see the fallenesse of what *Nayler* speaks in his word of conclusion to us five: as if we had uttered *many untruths, and false reports*, taken up by heare-say, without any ground at all, and divers things out of Books, which we have on purpose wrested to slander with, &c. Thou wilt in this reply, see the fullest evidence we think that can be given as to such cases, and all these particulars that he excepts against, made the more apparant unto all. We professe before the Lord, that it is nothing we have against their persons, that should any way leade us to wrest any of their writings to make them odious: it is our onely zeale for the truth and Saints of the high God, that hath carried out our spirits thus to expose our selves to the revilings of all this generation, if by any meanes we might be serviceable to the Gospel, and save our selves, and them that heare us.

Thou wilt finde in the close of *Naylers* Booke two leaves put forth in the name of one, who sayes, *his name is the Flesh is John Andland*: tis such a perfect piece of bitterness and rayling, and no way in answer to our Booke, that we leave it for waste Paper.

Thus having been carried on by the *Everlasting Arme*, and drawne out by the *swords of Love* to our deare Lord *Iesus* his Ordinances, and his Saints, to beare witness to the true grace of God wherein we stand; we shall sit downe in comfort, and fly to him, who is a refuge from the storme, and a shadow from the heat, when the blast of the terrible ones shall be as the storme against the Wall.

F I N I S.



ve  
ou  
in  
o-  
g  
ac  
o  
of  
  
as  
d  
y,  
th  
is  
o  
de  
at  
y  
l-  
n  
es  
ve  
d  
  
es  
se  
-  
or  
  
d  
is  
e  
d  
se  
e